

VOL. XL, 3

WHOLE NO. 159

GENERAL LIBRARY
OCT 23 1919

UNIV. OF MICH.

THE

AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

BASIL LANNEAU GILDERSLEEVE

HONORARY FRANCIS WHITE PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

AND

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

JULY, AUGUST, SEPTEMBER

1919

BALTIMORE: THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

LONDON: ARTHUR F. BIRD

PARIS: ALBERT FONTENAY

LEIPZIG: F. A. BROCKHAUS

Entered as second-class matter October 18, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917.
Authorized on July 5, 1928.

CONTENTS.

I.—References to Literature in Plautus and Terence. By CHARLES KNAPP,	231
II.—The Use and Range of the Future Participle. By EMORY B. LEASE,	262
III.—Problems in Delphian Chronology. By ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON,	286
IV.—Satura Rediviva. By M. C. WAITES,	308
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	317
<div style="text-align: center;"> Radin's <i>The Genetic Relationship of the North American Indian Languages</i>.—Lalis' <i>Lietuviškos ir angliškos kalbų žodynas</i>.—Juškevič's <i>Litovskij Slovari</i>.—Wells' <i>First Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1400</i>. </div>	
REPORTS:	325
Philologus.—Glotta.	
BRIEF MENTION,	332
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	338
BOOKS RECEIVED,	341

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology—classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage, 50 cents, extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor, Professor C. W. E. MILLER, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Subscriptions, remittances and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

The Lord Baltimore Press

BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XL, 3.

WHOLE No. 159.

I.—REFERENCES TO LITERATURE¹ IN PLAUTUS AND TERENCE.

In Plautus and Terence there are many passages which deal with literary or quasi-literary matters. For the most part such references are Greek in origin and character, though we shall find, especially in Plautus, a surprising amount of material bearing on Latin literature rather than on Greek.²

The references fall into two main classes. Of these one deals primarily with the stories³ that form so large a part of Greek literature, especially of Greek dramatic literature.⁴ The other consists of allusions to literary works or literary passages, which are, in general, not named.

¹ I use this term in a very wide sense, to cover some things that might well fall also under such captions as folklore, mythology, and religion. By the time of Menander, Philemon, and Diphilus, and even more by that of Plautus and Terence, such matters had become, in part at least, bookish. Certainly, from the point of view indicated in footnote 3, below, the inclusion here of such matters is warranted.

² This remark applies more fully to matters to be discussed in a later paper, as a continuation of the present discussion. See note 4.

³ Long after the present paper had been begun I found that Professor F. F. Abbott, in his *Society and Politics in Ancient Rome* (1909), 178-179, had sought to infer the intellectual interests and capacities of Plautus's audiences by noting what Greek myths appear in his plays. So Professor J. S. Reid, in his edition of the *Academica* (1885), page 20, uses the allusions to philosophy and the philosophical reflections in the fragments of the Roman drama, tragic and comic, as a means of determining the measure of Roman acquaintance with philosophic matters. He appends three references to Terence, but none to Plautus, a much more important source of information in this connection. See page 248, note 2.

⁴ This class only will be considered in this paper.

In both classes the allusion is frequently, perhaps more commonly, employed for purposes of parody. Further, the effectiveness of the parody is increased by the fact that it is frequently put into the mouth of a slave¹; in the disparity between the sentiments uttered and the status of the speaker lies much of the fun.

Sometimes we need to bring the two classes of allusions into closest relation to each other. Thus, we have numerous allusions in Plautus to the story of the Trojan War and the various matters contained in the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and the *Cyclic Poems*: see e. g. Ba. 925-978 (cf. below, pp. 258-260). Here Latin and Greek works both were in Plautus's mind; the Latin works rather than the Greek were likely to be in the minds of the spectators. In several passages Plautus had specific parts of the *Odyssey*, at least, in mind. The references to matters involving the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and the *Cyclic Poems* (see pp. 254-260) are especially interesting in view of the belief, first securely established in Plautus's time,² in the Trojan origin of the Romans and in view of the predominance of the Trojan War among the themes of Roman tragedy.³

¹ In his paper, *The Ancient Editions of Plautus*, 48, note e, Professor Lindsay wrote thus: "How far Plautus suits his language, his metre, and perhaps his prosody to his characters is a subject that would reward investigation". The present paper shows that there is another question: How far does Plautus, to gain comic effect, fail, on the surface, to adapt the language to his characters, in that he makes them speak of things of which, one would say, they would not naturally speak? Though, we may be sure, some slaves exceeded their masters in culture, slaves must often have been illiterate (witness the freedmen in the *Cena Trimalchionis*, though Professor C. W. Mendell, in a paper entitled *Petronius and the Greek Romance*, in *Classical Philology*, XII, 158-172, denies the realistic character of Petronius's work. For its realistic character see e. g. the two discussions by Professor F. F. Abbott, in *The Common People of Ancient Rome*, 117-144, and in *Society and Politics in Ancient Rome*, 115-130). In a note on *Aristophanes*, *Ranae* 554, Professor Tucker declares that the Greek comic writers do not make vulgar people speak vulgar Attic.

In view of what is written above, I have thought it well to indicate in this paper the rôles played by the speakers of the various passages cited.

² See especially Nettleship, *The Story of Aeneas's Wanderings*, in Conington's *Vergil*, 2. l-iii.

³ Livius Andronicus wrote an *Achilles*, an *Ajax Mastigophorus*, an *Aegisthus*, and an *Equos Troianus*. See Ribbeck, *Römische Dichtung*,²

I.

A study of the words *graphicus*, *poema*, and *poeta*¹ is not without value for our purposes. Once *graphicus* gives us real help, St. 570.² In 505 ff. Antipho senex has been seeking an invitation to dinner from his sons-in-law; driven to desperation by his failure he has tried the effect of an elaborate *apologus* ('allegory', 'parable': cf. Gellius 2. 29. 1) in 538 ff. At 570 Pamphilippus cries: *Graphicum mortalem Antiphonem! Ut apologum fecit quam fabre!*³

II.

Several references to historical personages may be included here, because their ultimate source is, to some extent at least, bookish.

Agathocles.—In Men. 369 ff. Menaechmus II Syracusanus has denied knowledge of Erotium meretrix; the latter, astounded and hurt by what she tries to regard as a joke,⁴ cries (407 ff.):

Non ego te novi Menaechum, Moscho prognatum patre,
qui Syracusis perhibere natus esse in Sicilia,
ubi rex Agathocles regnator fuit et iterum Pintia,
tertium Liparo, qui in morte regnum Hieroni tradidit,
nunc Hiero est?

1. 17. For Naevius's use of the Trojan War story see Ribbeck again, 1. 20, for Ennius's, 1. 29. Naevius wrote an *Equos Troianus* and a *Hector Proficiscens*. Half of Ennius's plays dealt with the Trojan cycle. See further e. g. Teuffel, 102; Ribbeck, *Römische Tragödie*, 684; Sellar, *Roman Poets of the Republic*, 85; Duff, *A Literary History of Rome*, 125, 128, 142.

²The use of *poema* and *poeta* in Plautus I have discussed fully in *Classical Philology*, XII, 149, and footnote. The suggestion in the footnote, that Plautus at times deliberately used *poeta* in parody of Naevius's proud application of that term to himself, has direct bearing on our present inquiry. In this connection, we may well recall Plautus's reference, in Mi. 208-212, to Naevius's imprisonment. So, too, the discussion in *Classical Philology*, XII, 156-157, of *describo*, *pingo*, *depingo*, *pictor* and *pictura* in Plautus is in point now.

³I use Lindsay's text. The punctuation, capitalization, and at times the spelling are mine.

⁴The other examples of *graphicus* (Ep. 410; Ps. 519, 700; Tr. 936, 1024) and of *graphice* (Pe. 306, 464, 843; Tr. 767) do not directly help us.

⁵For Menaechmus I Epidamniensis as a practical joker and the bearing of that circumstance on this scene and others in the play, see A. J. P. XXXV 27, n. 1.

This is a most amusing jumble of fact and fancy: see Brix-Niemeyer⁵ (1912) and Fowler ad loc. Mr. P. Thoresby Jones, in his edition (1918), is too serious by far when he writes, "Plautus (or his Greek original) is true to life in representing a woman of Erotium's class as guilty of such blunders. An Aspasia was rare." In Ps. 524-530 Pseudolus servos, speaking in burlesque tone, promises a pugnam claram et commemorabilem (525). At 531-532 Simo senex exclaims, si quidem istaec opera, ut praedicas, perfeceris, virtute regi Agathocli antecesseris. In Mo. 775 ff. Tranio servos counts himself as great as Alexander Magnus and Agathocles.

Alexander.—See above, under Agathocles. The foundation of Alexandria by Alexander the Great is perhaps referred to by Gripus servos (piscator) as he builds castles in Spain, Ru. 933a-935a. See below, under Stratonicus.

Antiochus.—In Poe. 693-694 Collybiscus vilicus, masquerading as a miles, says:

Ego id quaero hospitium ubi ego curer mollius
quam regi Antiocho oculi curari solent¹.

Attalus.—In Pe. 339 Saturio parasitus mentions rex Philippus and Attalus. In Poe. 644 ff. the Advocati are telling Lycus leno about the miles, who had that day arrived in Calydon, and wishes *potare, amare* (655-661). Compare now 662-666:

ADV. At enim hic clam, furtim esse volt, ne quis sciat
neve arbiter sit, nam hic latro in Sparta fuit,
ut quidem ipse nobis dixit, apud regem Attalum;
inde nunc aufugit, quoniam capitur oppidum.

CO. Nimis lepide de latrone, de Sparta optume.

Here Plautus takes the pains to tell us (666) that he has been jesting.

¹ The point of these verses is lost to us. Salmasius guessed that the original of the Poenulus was written in the lifetime of Antiochus, and that the latter had had trouble with his eyes. Rost, *Opuscula Plautina* 1. 19, suggested that Antiochus, "mollitiei omni deditus" (so Vissering, *Quaestiones Plautinae* 32), had, for reasons now unknown, given special care to his eyes. Naudet mentions the view of some that favorites of Antiochus were known as his 'eyes' and 'ears'; he refers to Pollux 2. 7. In his App. Crit. Leo writes simply: "nihil mollius quam oculos curamus, ut nihil magis quam oculos amamus". The Romans often talked of loving something *magis oculis* or of something as *carius oculis*.

Dareus.—See below, under Philippus.

Hiero.—See above, under Agathocles.

Iason.—In Ps. 173 ff. Ballio leno bids his meretrices bring him profit. One is to bring him stores of grain (188 ff.), ut civitas nomen mihi commutet meque ut praedicet lenone ex Ballione regem Iasonem (192-193). On this Calidorus adulescens remarks, to Pseudolus servos (193-194), Audin? furcifer satin magnificus tibi videtur? See Professor E. P. Morris, on 193. H. W. Auden, in his annotated edition (1896), reads *Iasionem*, thinking of a Cretan, son of Zeus and Electra, and father, by Ceres, of Plutus. See the article Iasion in Pauly-Wissowa, 8. 751-758. Leo, in his text-edition, read *Iasonem*, interpreting of the personage whom Auden calls Iasion.

Liparo.—See above, under Agathocles.

Lycurgus.—In Ba. 111 Lydus paedagogus refers to Lycurgus, the law-giver.

Philippus.—See above, under Attalus. In Au. 85-88 Euclio senex says to Staphyla anus: Mirum quin tua me caussa faciat Iuppiter Philippum regem aut Dareum, trivenefica. In Au. 701 ff., Lyconidis servos, exulting because he has the miser's *aula*, says, ego sum ille rex Philippus. O lepidum diem! The frequent references to the coin called Philippus or Philippeus are more or less in point. J. Egli, Die Hyperbel in den Komödien des Plautus und in Ciceros Briefen an Atticus, 3. 18, and Vissering, Quaestiones Plautinae 31, hold that the name Philippus, like Croesus, was proverbial for great wealth.

Pintia.—See above, under Agathocles.

Pyrrhus.—In Eun. 781-783 we have a very amusing reference, in a burlesque passage (see from 771), by Thraso miles to Pyrrhus's skill as a strategist.

Seleucus.—In Mi. 75-77 the soldier declares that he has been requested by rex Seleucus to enroll mercenaries for him. In 948-950 he states that he had sent his parasite to take the *latrones* to the king. Seleucia is mentioned several times in the Trinummus (112, 771, 845).

Stratonicus.—In Ru. 932 Gripus servos (a piscator), building castles in Spain on the strength of the *vidulus* he had fished

up from the sea, says, *Post animi caussa mihi navem faciam atque imitabor Stratonicum, oppida circumvectabor.*¹

III. ACCHERON; ORCUS.²

Accheron.—In Poe. 71 the prologist declares that the father who had lost Agorastocles, the stolen boy, *ipse abit ad Accheruntem sine viatico*. Naudet interprets *sine viatico* of the lack of the precious things commonly set on the funeral pyre or in or on the tomb, especially of the lack of money needed to pay Charon; for that money compare e. g. such well-known passages as Aristophanes, *Ranae* 141, Juv. 3. 265–267, Swift, *The Battle of the Books*, last paragraph.

In Poe. 344 *Adelphasium puella* promises <cum Agorastocle palpare et lalare> quo die Orcus Accherunte mortuos amiserit. This verse has a proverbial ring (reminding one of references to the Greek Kalends) and so has definite connection, perhaps, with literature. Closely akin are the words of *Astaphium ancilla* in Tru. 747–750.

Ca. 999–1000 contains an interesting and important reference to paintings of Acheron. See my paper, *References to Painting in Plautus and Terence*, *Classical Philology*, XII, 150.

In Tr. 525 *Stasimus servos*, seeking to deter Philto senex from accepting the *ager* as a dowry for *Lesbonicus's* sister, if she marries his son, says: *Accheruntis ostium in nostrost agro*. With this compare Ba. 368, cited below, under Orcus.³

¹ Professor Sonnenschein, following Ussing, holds that the reference is to a celebrated musician, contemporary of Diphilus, who travelled about in Greece to exhibit his skill. "Diphilus", he adds, "appears . . . in the original of this play to have indulged in a little light banter of the successful performer Stratonicus". Dousa, however, in the Naudet (Lemaire) edition, thinks that Stratonicus was a "quaestor regis Philippi, et deinde Alexandri Magni", whose wealth passed into a proverb. In any case to Plautus's audience the reference was bookish.

² See notes 1 and 3. Matters of religion, too, were by the time of the New Attic Comedy and the days of Plautus and Terence more or less bookish. The stories figured too in painting: see the discussion, referred to in the text, of Ca. 999–1000, and, perhaps, of the Alcmena story (below, pages 239–242).

³ Less significant are certain other passages. In Cas. 159 ff. *Cleustrata matrona* calls her husband *Accheruntis pabulum*. *Accherunticus*, used

Orcus.—For *Orcus* see first *Poe.* 344, cited above, page 236. In *Ba.* 368, *Lydus paedagogus* calls the house of the *Bacchides ianuam Orci*. Compare *Tr.* 525, cited in the preceding paragraph. See further *As.* 606–607 (*adulescens*):

ARG. Vale. PH. Quo properas? ARG. Bene vale: apud Orcum te videbo,
nam equidem me iam quantum potest a vita abiudicabo.

The addition of an explanatory line, wholly Latin, is here natural enough.

In *Ca.* 282–284 *Hegio* is questioning *Philocrates*, whom he takes to be the slave *Tyndarus*, thus:

HE. Quid pater? vivitne? PH. Vivom, quom inde abimus, liquimus:
nunc vivatne necne, id Orcum scire oportet scilicet.
TY. Salva res est: philosophatur quoque iam, non mendax modo est.

The last verse (on it see further below, page 261, note 1) is justification enough for including in this paper references to *Acheron* and *Orcus*.

In *Hec.* 852–853 *Pamphilus adulescens* says to *Parmeno* his slave, who had brought him good news,

Egon¹ qui ab Orco mortuom me reducem in lucem feceris
sinam sine munere a me abire?

There may be a reference here to the *Orpheus-Eurydice* story. In 874–875 *Parmeno*, tantalized because no one will explain to him the happenings of the play, cries, evidently with the foregoing passage in mind: *Tamen suspicor: ego hunc ab Orco mortuom quo pacto . . . !*

Other passages, which there is not space here to quote, are *Ep.* 173–177 (*senex*), 362–363 (*adulescens*), *Ps.* 795–797 (*leno*).

twice derisively by a *senex* of an old man (*Mer.* 290–291, *Mi.* 627–630), has a proverbial ring. In *Poe.* 428–431, 827–833 gentleman and slave, the latter with special detail, dwell on the number and the varied classes of the dead in *Acheron*. Kindred to these passages is the reference in *Tr.* 493–494 by a *senex* to the fact that *Acheron* is no respecter of persons; there, at least, the rich and the poor are on a par. See, finally, *Ba.* 199 (*adulescens*), *Ca.* 689 (*senex*), *Cas.* 448 (*servos*), *Am.* 1029 (*Amphitruo dux*), *Am.* 1078 (*Amphitruo*), *Mo.* 499 (*Tranio servos* professes to quote the ghost of a gentleman). Note that the words in parenthesis here and elsewhere in like cases give the rôle played by the speaker. See above, page 232, note 1, end.

¹ *Sc. te* as the subject of *abire*, and as antecedent of *qui*.

IV.

A. STORIES APART FROM THOSE RELATING TO THE TROJAN WAR.

Let us consider now the stories to which allusion more or less definite is made. Quite often the allusion is made by an actor as he enters, particularly if he is to occupy the stage for a time *solus*.¹ For convenience of reference the passages are arranged in an alphabetical sequence of story-titles and theme-titles.

Aeacides.—In the *Asinaria* Libanus servos calls attention to the (supposed) Saurea, who is entering at 403 *quassanti capite*, adding (404): *quisque obviam huic ocesserit irato vapulabit*. The Mercator rejoins (405-406):

*Siquidem hercle Aeacidinis minis animisque expletus cedit,
si med iratus tetigerit, iratus vapulabit.*

Ajax, Alcumeus.—See below, pp. 238-239. In Ca. 561-563 there is reference (by Tyndarus servos) to three famous madmen of Greek story, Lycurgus, Orestes, and Alcumeus (Alcmaeon). In Ca. 613 ff. there is a very interesting reference to mad Ajax.² See also below, page 241, note 1.

In Cis. 639-644 there is a delicious parody of a suicide scene, which may well have reminded the audience of plays both Greek and Latin, e. g. the Ajax of Sophocles, and the Ajax Mastigophorus of Livius Andronicus.³

In Men. 828-875 is the famous scene in which Menaechmus II Syracusanus, by pretending to be mad, drives off the matrona and her father. The scene is too long to reproduce here. This passage and Ca. 547-616 are to be compared each with the other, in detail, as giving some hints of the diagnosis and pathology of insanity among the Romans. Compare especially Ca. 557 *Viden tu hunc quam inimico voltu intuitur? concedi optumumst, Hegio: fit quod tibi ego dixi—gliscit rabies—cave*

¹ The best example is Ba. 925 ff., the passage so excellent in many ways (see below, pp. 258-260). Others are Ru. 83 ff., Pe. 1 ff., 251 ff., Mer. 469, Ru. 593 ff.

² With this passage compare (with Lindsay's note in his annotated edition, on 562) Anacr. 31: *Θέλω, θέλω μανῆναι· 'Εμάλινετ' 'Αλκμάλων τε Χά λευκόπους 'Ορέστης, τὰς μητέρας κτανόντες.*

³ See Suetonius, Aug. 85, for Augustus's parodic description of the fate of his tragedy, Ajax.

tibi, with Men. 828 *Viden tu illic oculos virere?* Compare also Ca. 595-596 *Viden tu illi maculari corpus totum maculis luridis?* *Atra bilis agitat hominem*, with Men. 829-830 *ut viridis exoritur colos ex temporibus atque fronte! ut oculi scintillant vide!*

I cannot help connecting these passages with certain characteristics of Ennius's tragic style. Duff, *A Literary History of Rome*, 142, writing of Ennius, well says:

In tragedy the preference of the age was for Greek themes with moving situations, such as the revenge of Medea, the guilt of the house of Atreus, the sacrifice of Iphigenia, and other portions of the Trojan Cycle, comprising in conflict, danger, and bloodshed the requisite appeals to pity and fear.

See Mommsen, *History of Rome*, English Translation, 2. 252; Dimsdale, *A History of Latin Literature*, 22. Scenes of suicide, surely, would be in keeping with such preference. Ennius's fondness for scenes in which some one goes mad is marked; he displays in general a love of the fantastic—for the prophetic frenzy of a Cassandra or the madness of an Alcumeo (this motive had already appeared in both Livius and Naevius). His Ajax, Eumenides, and Athamas all have to do with some form of mental derangement.

If my point here is well taken, it is one of great importance. Vahlen, in discussing the relations between Ennius and Plautus, felt obliged to content himself with a reference to the prologue of the *Poenulus* and to a few passages of Plautus, which, he thinks, show imitation of Ennius. I have not been able, myself, however, to see such imitation in these passages. See my remarks in *American Journal of Philology*, XXXII 16. But if I am right above, we have in the Plautine passages there discussed valuable contemporary evidence on two points: (a) Plautus's relation to Ennius, (b) the general question of Ennius's fame in his own time, a fame and reputation based on work antecedent to the composition, or at least to the publication, of the *Annales*. See further my remarks in *Classical Philology*, XIV, 49-51, with notes, and below, page 258.

Alcmaeon.—See above, under *Ajax*, page 238.

Alcumena.—The *Alcumena* (Ἀλκμήνη) - *Amphitruo*-*Iupiter*-*Iuno*-*Hercules* story is, of course, omnipresent in the *Amphitruo*. The *Alcumena* story appears again in *Mer.* 690. In

Mer. 667 ff. Dorippa, wife of Lysimachus senex, and Syra anus, her attendant, come from the country to town. Syra enters the house and finds there the ancilla that belongs to their neighbor Demipho, the amorous senex. Of course she misunderstands the situation. She hurries out again, and at 689-690 cries to her mistress: *I hac mecum, ut videas simul tuam Alcumenam paelicem, Iuno mea.*

Verses 83-88 of the *Rudens*, spoken by Sceparnio servos as he enters, to begin the play proper, are full of difficulty:

*Pro di immortales, tempestatem quouismodi
Neptunus nobis nocte hac misit proxuma!
Detexit ventus villam—quid verbis opust?
Non ventus fuit, verum Alcumena Euripidi:
ita omnis de tecto deturbavit tegulas;
inlustriores fecit fenestrasque indidit.*

Professor Sonnenschein, the latest editor of the *Rudens*, in neither version of his edition (the maior in 1891, the minor in 1901), offers a solution. All he was able to say was this: "The precise point of comparison between the wind and the lost play of Euripides, or the chief character in it, is obscure: the 'tertium quid' may be either violence in general or the unroofing of a building in particular". Nor does the further remark (in the editio maior) that "Hermann suggests that in the original of Diphilus the passage may have run: *τί δ' ἄνεμος; Ἀλκμήνη μὲν ἦν Εὐριπίδου*", explain the point of *Alcumena Euripidi*. Professor Sonnenschein is but reflecting the helplessness of the earlier editors of Plautus; one after the other they repeat, in terms or in substance, Lambinus's suggestion that there was a tragedy of Euripides in which "quum Alcumena pariebat, Jupiter faciebat spurcam tempestatem oriri". Thornton (Translation 2. 272-273) accepts this view, and even goes so far as to conjecture that the Euripidean play in question supplied material for the *Amphitruo*, especially for the more serious parts of the Plautine play. C. S. Harrington, in an edition of the *Captivi*, *Trinummus* and *Rudens*, with very brief notes (1870), took the same view.

Now, if there was a play of Euripides with such a theme, we should at once think in connection with it of Plautus *Amphitruo* 1059 ff., especially 1062 ff., 1094 ff.¹ But for the existence

¹ Nothing is said in this play of *ventus*!

of such a play neither Lambinus nor anyone else has produced any evidence whatever. What has happened is this, I take it: in trying to find some explanation of Sceparnio's words Lambinus thought of the *Amphitruo*, and from that argued for the theme of the Euripidean play Sceparnio had in mind. A good example of *petitio principii*, surely.

In editing Euripides for the Teubner text series Nauck gathered into Volume 3 (1892) the fragments of Euripides. On pages 20-23 he gives 17 citations, aggregating 28 verses, from an *'Αλκμήνη*. Prefixed to this collection is the following note by Nauck: "Omittit hanc fabulam marmor Albanum (C. I. 6047), argumentum ignoramus. Plautus Rudent. I. I. 4: *proh di . . . Euripidi*". Clearly Nauck did not question the reading in Plautus. But in the 28 verses of the *'Αλκμήνη* I fail to find anything that in the remotest degree resembles the situation in the *Rudens* or that in the *Amphitruo*.

Our investigation, evidently, has not carried us very far. If we keep the reading *Alcumena* (and there is no variation in the MSS), we are not in position to improve upon Lambinus's view, utterly unsupported though that view is.¹

¹ Nauck, l. c. 14-20, gives 23 fragments of two plays, by Euripides, called *'Αλκμέων* or *'Αλκμαίων*. The fragments aggregate 47 verses, whole or partial. It is clear enough from Nauck, 15, that in both plays the madness of Alcmaeon was in evidence. It would be possible to read in Ru. 86, in place of *Alcumena*, Plautus's form of *'Αλκμαίων*, *Alcumeus*, seen in Ca. 562. For a scribe who had some knowledge of Plautus the thought of the *Amphitruo* might easily have led to the alteration of *Alcumeus* to *Alcumena*. An allusion to the madness of Alcmaeon (*Alcumeus*) seems more natural and more intelligible by itself in the mouth of one seeking to describe a wild tempest than would be a reference to *Alcumena*, who, in Plautus's *Amphitruo* at least, is the very embodiment of the stately calmness one associates with the Roman *matrona* at her best. As seen above, page 238, the madness of Alcmaeon was proverbial (see under *Ajax*). Palaeographically, the substitution of *Alcumena* for *Alcumeus* is not inconceivable.

The suggestion made in the foregoing paragraph does far less violence to the MS evidence than is done by the emendation proposed, in *The Classical Review* 27. 159, by Mr. D. A. Slater: "In view of passages like the *Bacchae*, 576-689 and *H. F.* 874 sqq., it may be felt that some generalization would be more natural in this context, to suggest 'a storm such as blows in the pages of Euripides', rather than the name

When I wrote the above, I overlooked Professor Sonnenschein's discussion in *The Classical Review* 28 (1914), 40-41. He accepts a view, suggested first, apparently, by Engelmann, in 1882, that certain vases, two in number, show scenes or a scene which "must have formed part of the story of the lost play <the Alkmene> of Euripides." These vases display a storm of rain. On the basis of these vases, as interpreted by Engelmann, K. Wernicke, in *Pauly-Wissowa* 1. 1573 (1894), held that in the Alkmene of Euripides Amphitruo planned to burn Alcmene to death, but that the pyre was extinguished by a storm of rain sent by Zeus. Admitting, for the sake of argument, that Engelmann and others rightly interpret the vases (Nauck, *TGF.*², p. 386, refers to Engelmann's paper, and seems to favor his theory), we still need light on the contrast between *ventus* and *Alcumena Euripidi*. When Professor Sonnenschein says, "The story has disappeared from literature; but it has left a trace behind in the allusion which Plautus makes to it in *Rud.* 86," he is writing with less than his usual exactness: what does he mean by "the story"? Again, he stresses the fact that "the particular storm <of the Rudens> was <the Italics are his> accompanied by rain; see l. 576 f. . . ." But, in order to get the other member of Plautus's comparison, we need to know *what* it was that, in some play, Euripides mentioned in connection with the Alcmene story that would outdo a *ventus*. This we do not yet know, pace Professor Sonnenschein and the array of scholars he cited in his note.

of a single character (however demented) from a play that had perished". Hence he would read

non ventus fuit verum ruina Euripidi,

taking *ruina* in the sense of 'cataclysm'. He supposes that by haplography the *rum* of *verum* was lost before *ruina*, so that the line became NONVENTUSFVITVERVINAEURIPIDI. He writes thus: "... if we may assume that the allusion was explained by a reference in the margin to the 'Alcumenae filius', it would not be unreasonable to suppose that the editor or corrector reduced the line to metre by interpreting the forlorn A in the text to mean 'Alcumena'". This does violence at once to palaeography and to Plautus's manner, which, surely, is to use names rather than such vague generalities as *ruina* (for proof see the present paper, *passim*). Further, Mr. Slater's suggestions postulate a truly remarkable editor or corrector.

Alcumeus (Alcmaeon).—See above, under Ajax, page 238.

Argus (Io).—Au. 551-559 is a most interesting passage. Megadorus senex has sent cooks, etc., into the house of Euclio, his prospective father-in-law (280-360). The latter, desperate with fear for his pot of gold, drove them out with a club (406 ff.). Later he meets Megadorus, and the following dialogue ensues (550-559):

EVC. Pol ego te ut accusem merito meditar. ME. Quid est?

EVC. Quid sit me rogitas? qui mihi omnis angulos
furum implevisti in aedibus misero mihi,
qui mi intro misti in aedis quingentos coquos
cum senis manibus, genere Geryonaceo;
quos si Argus servet, qui oculus totus fuit,
quem quondam Ioni Iuno custodem addidit,
is numquam servet, praeterea tibicinam,
quae mi interbibere sola, si vino scatat,
Corinthiensem fontem Pirenem potest.

A bookish passage, surely.

Bacchae.—In several places reference is made to the Bacchae and their orgies. In part these references reflect common modes of speech (are proverbial), in part they seem to be reflections of contemporary Roman life¹ (in the early part of the second century B. C. the Bacchanalian orgies were giving trouble to the government at Rome: recall the *Senatus Consultum De Bacchanalibus*, and note especially Cas. 980, cited below), in part they seem to me bookish.² I have therefore included them all here.

In Am. 703-705 Sosia servos, rebuked by his master Amphitruo for agreeing with Alcumena, cries:

Non tu scis? Bacchae bacchanti si velis advorsarier,
ex insana insaniorem facies, feriet saepius;
si opsequare, una resolves plaga.

In Au. 408 Congrio cocus, who has been driven violently forth by Euclio senex, cries, neque ego umquam nisi hodie ad Bacchas

¹ If this suggestion is correct, we have evidence of Plautus's interest in contemporary life, another case in which he reflects that life. Every proof that Plautus was interested in contemporary Roman life, social, religious, and political, and would and could refer to it, increases the possibility that he referred to contemporary writers and contemporary writings.

² In another paper I shall seek to show that Plautus knew the Bacchae of Euripides.

veni in bacchanal coquinatum, ita me miserum et meos discipulos fustibus male contuderunt. Cf. also 411 a. Cas. 978 ff. is even more interesting (the speakers are a senex and two matronae—Lysidamus, Cleustrata and Myrrhina):

CL. Quin responde, tuo quid factum est pallio?

LY. Bacchae hercle, uxor—CL. Bacchae? LY. Bacchae hercle, uxor—MY. Nugatur sciens, nam ecaster nunc Bacchae nullae ludunt¹. LY. Oblitus fui, sed tamen Bacchae—CL. Quid Bacchae?

After this point the play is badly mutilated for some verses.

At Mi. 818 Lurcio puer enters, in answer to Palaestrio's call for Sceledrus, to say that the latter *sorbet dormiens, tetigit calicem clanculum* (823). He describes in comic vein the drinking of Sceledrus, thus (855 ff.):

opera maxuma,
ubi bacchabatur aula, cassabant cadi.
PA. Abi, abi intro iam. Vos in cella vinaria
bacchanal facitis.

Interesting too is Mi. 1015–1016. In 1013 Palaestrio servos describes himself to Milphidippa ancilla as *socium tuorum conciliorum et participem consiliorum*. In 1016 she says: *Cedo signum, si harunc Baccharum es*; one is strongly tempted to render by 'Give the password'. Palaestrio does in fact give the password when he replies at once, *Amat mulier quaedam quendam*.

References in the Bacchides to the Bacchae were of course inevitable. In 53 Pistoclerus adulescens, resisting Bacchis's invitation to enter her house, says, Bacchis, Bacchas metuo et bacchanal tuom. In 368 Lydus paedagogus calls the house of the Bacchides *ianuam hanc Orci*; in 371 he cries, Bacchides non Bacchides, sed Bacchae sunt acerrumae. Cf. 372 ff. Finally, in Men. 835 ff., Menaechmus II Syracusanus, pretending to be mad, cries wildly:

Euhoe atque euhoe², Bromie, quo me in silvam venatum vocas?
Audio, sed non abire possum ab his regionibus:
ita illa me ab laeva rabiosa femina adservat canes.

¹ It is hard not to see here an allusion to efforts by the government to repress the Bacchanalian orgies: see above, page 243.

² That such a passage may rest on books (be parodic), as well as on actual life, can be seen from e. g. Horace, Carm. 2. 19, 3. 25.

The matrona is here thought of as one of the Bacchae. Here, surely, there is travesty of some tragic original: on this whole scene see pp. 238 f. For a reference to the Bacchae which is beyond question bookish, see below, under Pentheus, page 252.

Bellerophon.—In the Bacchides Chrysalus servos carries a letter from Mnesilochus to his father Nicobulus, in which the son had asked his father to keep Chrysalus bound at home (735-747). Nicobulus, having read the letter (790-793), bids Chrysalus wait a moment (794), and goes within his house, to return at 799 with slaves who are to bind Chrysalus. At 809 he explains by showing the letter to Chrysalus¹ and saying, *Em hae te vinciri iubent*. At 810-811 the latter rejoins, with great pretended bitterness: Aha, Bellerophantam tuos me fecit filius: egomet tabellas tetuli ut vincirer.

Circe.—In Epid. 604 Periphanes senex calls the girl whom he had mistakenly supposed to be his daughter *hanc . . . Circam Solis filiam*.

Danaides.—In Ps. 101-102 Pseudolus servos says to his master Calidorus:

quod tu istis lacrumis te probare postulas,
non pluris refert quam si imbrim in cribrum geras.

See Lorenz and Morris ad loc. In 369 Pseudolus says *In pertusum ingerimus dicta dolium: operam ludimus*. See Morris here. If the reference in these passages really is to the story of the Danaides, the omission of the name is significant.

Dirce.—In Ps. 196 ff. Ballio leno, threatening Aeschrodora meretrix unless she brings him much profit, says (198-201): *cras te quasi Dircam olim ut memorant duo gnati Iovis devinxere ad taurum, item ego te distringam ad carnarium: id tibi profecto taurus fiet*.

Eurydice-Orpheus.—See Hec. 852-853, discussed above, page 237, under Orcus.

Ganymedes.—In Men. 110 Menaechmus I Epidamniensis comes out of his house, intending to carry to Erotium meretrix a *palla* which he has stolen from his wife. As he commends himself on his shrewdness in overreaching his wife, Peniculus

¹ Chrysalus servos can read: cf. 1023.

parasitus overhears him and applies for a share of the plunder (135). At 141 ff. this dialogue ensues:

MEN. Vin tu facinus luculentum inspicere? PE. Quis id coxit coquos?
Iam sciam, si quid titubatumst, ubi reliquias videro.

MEN. Dic mi, enumquam tu vidisti tabulam pictam¹ in pariete
ubi aquila Catameitum raperet aut ubi Venus Adoneum?²

PE. Saepe. Sed quid istae picturae ad me attinent?

Menaechmus's allusion is, to be sure, rather far-fetched; he thinks of himself as the eagle or as Venus, of the cloak as Ganymede or as Adonis. But precisely in this, as in the (deliberate) perversion of the name Ganymedes, lies part of the fun of this grandiloquent utterance (see also note 2, below).

There may be another reference to the story of Ganymede, in a corrupt passage, Tr. 946-947. The sycophanta, in a description of his imaginary journeyings, had declared in 940 ff. that he had reached heaven itself. Charmides senex then says: pudicum neminem . . . † re oportet, qui aps terra ad caelum pervenerit.

Geryones.—See above, under Argus, page 243.

Halcyones.—Compare Cas. Prol. 24-26 (a non-Plautine prologue, in part), in an address to the spectators:

Ne quis formidet flagitorem suum;
ludi sunt, ludus datus est argentariis;
tranquillum est, Alcedonia sunt circum forum.

In Poe. 355-356 Agorastocles adulescens says to his slave Milphio:

¹ On the reference here to painting see my paper, *References to Painting in Plautus and Terence*, *Classical Philology*, XII, 152-153.

² For Venus's love of Adonis see Dümmler, in *Pauly-Wissowa* I. 391-392. Compare especially these words: "Dass das Verhältnis notwendig als bräutliches, keusches aufgefasst worden sei . . . ist nicht als wesentlich für den Kult zuzugeben; die Vorstellung wurde erst durch die hellenistische Kunst begünstigt, die A., ihn mit Eros vermischend, in geradezu unreifem Alter darstellt. Aus einem solchen Bilde macht Plautus Men. I. 2. 34 einen Raub des A. durch Aphrodite. Die alexandrinische Feier <for which see Dümmler 386; cf. Theocr. 15> verbietet, das Verhältnis als platonisch aufzufassen, ganz abgesehen von dem Schmutz der Komödie, welcher keinen echt sagenhaften Hintergrund hat".

Plautus seems, then, to have blundered, whether by accident or by design. A deliberate perversion or confusion would be sufficiently humorous.

Iam hercle tu periisti, nisi illam mihi tam tranquillam facis
quam mare olimst quom ibi alcedo pullos educit suos.

Hercules.—The *Amphitruo* is concerned throughout, of course, with *Hercules*. For his birth and his feat in strangling the snakes (so well represented e. g. by the well-known fresco in the House of the Vettii at Pompeii) see 1107–1116, a narrative by *Bromia ancilla*.

In *Pe.* 1–5 *Toxilus servos* says to *Sagaristio servos*:

Qui amans egens ingressus est princeps in Amoris vias
superavit aerumnis is suis aerumnas Herculi,
nam cum leone, cum excetra, cum cervo, cum apro Aetolico,
cum avibus Stymphaliciis, cum Antaeo deluctari mavelim
quam cum Amore: ita fio miser quaerendo argento mutuo . . .

In *Epid.* 177–178 *Periphanes senex*, reminded of his dead wife, says:

Hercules ego fui, dum illa mecum fuit,
neque sexta aerumna acerbior Herculi quam illa mihi obiectast.

In *Men.* 199 ff. *Menaechmus I Epidamniensis*, speaking of his theft of a *palla* from his wife, proudly says:

Nimio ego hanc periculo
surrupui hodie: meo quidem animo ab *Hippolyta* subcingulum haud
Hercules aequè magno umquam apstulit periculo.

In *Ba.* 109 ff. *Lydus paedagogus* seeks to keep his younger master *Pistoclerus* out of the clutches of the *Bacchides*. At 147 *Pistoclerus* says: *Omitte, Lyde, ac cave malo*. *Lydus*, cut to the quick, cries (151 ff.):

LY. Vixisse nimio satiust iam quam vivere.
Magistron quemquam discipulum minitarier!
Nil moror discipulos mi esse iam plenos sanguinis:
valens adflctat me vacivom virium.

PI. Fiam, ut ego opinor, *Hercules*, tu autem *Linus*.

LY. Pol metuo magis ne *Phoenix* tuis factis fuam
teque ad patrem esse mortuom renuntiem.

PI. Satis *historiarumst*¹.

Lydus keeps the *Linus* story in mind; in 440–441, contrasting contemporary education with that of the good old days, he says: at nunc prius quam septuennis est, si attingas eum manu, extemplo puer paedagogi tabula dirrumpit caput.

¹ A very significant word here: compare *Men.* 247–248 and see my remarks in *Classical Philology*, II, 295, n. 1.

In Eun. 1026 ff. Thraso miles refers to the Hercules-Omphale story:

GN. Quid coeptas, Thraso?

TH. Egone? ut Thaidi me dedam et faciam quod iubeat. GN. Quid est? qui minus¹ quam Hercules servivit Omphalae? GN. Exemplum placet.

Utinam tibi commitigari videam sandalio caput.

The words of the senex in Men. 795-797, as he chides his daughter, are perhaps in point: servirin tibi postulas viros? dare una opera pensum postules, inter ancillas sedere iubeas, lanam carere.

For the Hercules-Phoenix story see Ba. 151 ff. cited above, page 247.

In Cas. 396 ff. we have this dialogue between two slaves:

CH. Deos quaeso—ut tua sors ex sitella ecfugerit.

OL. Ain tu? quia tute es fugitivos, omnis te imitari cupis? utinam tua quidem < tibi > sic, uti Herculeis praedicant quondam prognatis, in sortiundo sors deliquerit.

CH. Tu ut liquescas ipse, actutum virgis calefactabere.

See Naudet's edition here, and Pausanias 4. 3. 3-5, 4. 5. 1, with the notes in the Hitzig-Blümner edition.²

Obscure is Ru. 485-490. There Labrax leno, fresh from shipwreck, exclaims:

† qui homo sese miserum et mendicum volet,†
Neptuno credat sese atque aetatem suam,
nam si quis cum eo quid rei commiscuit,
ad hoc exemplum amittit ornatum domum.
Edepol, Libertas, lepida es, quae numquam pedem
voluisti in navem cum Hercule una imponere.

The commentators have been baffled here. Sonnenschein, in both editions (1891, 1901), merely wrote, "An allusion to some

¹ Sc. Thaidi me dedam.

² This is an extremely interesting passage. One would hardly expect an average audience, Roman or modern, to be familiar with the story of the trickery of Cresphontes and Temenus. This may be true, as has been argued, of others of the allusions cited in this paper. Indeed, it has been maintained "that the very strangeness of many things in the *comœdia palliata* added to the interest of the plays; the existence of the *togata* side by side with the *palliata* lends considerable support to this view" (so Professor A. L. Wheeler, in a review of Leffingwell, *Social and Private Life at Rome in the Time of Plautus and Terence*, which is to appear in *The Classical Weekly*, XIII).

lost myth about Herakles. Lucian (*De mercede conductis*, 23) says that *Libertas* never enters the house of a rich man". The reference to Lucian had been made by Gruter, and, after Gruter, by Leo, in his text-edition (1896). Ussing saw, somehow, a reference to the Hercules-Omphale story (for the appearance of that story in Plautus see above, page 248). Professor A. F. West, in *A. J. P.* XV 356, interpreted Hercules here and in *Mo.* 984, <Tranio> vel Herculi † *conterere quaestum potest* †, as a name for a very rich man. This interpretation he connects with the statement of Sonnenschein, quoted above, about Lucian *De Mercede Conductis* 23. There is, of course, no difficulty in thus interpreting Hercules—in the right context: see e. g. Horace, *Serm.* 2. 6. 10–14, and the editors there. Assuming, then, for the moment that Professor West's view of our passage is correct, compare *Au.* 226–235, said by *Euclio senex*, pauper, to *Megadorus senex*, *vir ditissimus*, his prospective son-in-law:

Venit hoc mihi, Megadore, in mentem, ted esse hominem divitem,
factiosum, me item esse hominem pauperum pauperrimum;
nunc si filiam locassim meam tibi, in mentem venit
te bovem esse et me esse asellum: ubi tecum coniunctus siem,
ubi onus nequeam ferre pariter, iaceam ego asinus in luto,
tu me bos magis hau respicias gnatus quasi numquam siem.
Et te utar iniquiore et meu' me ordo inrideat,
neutrubi habeam stabile stabulum, si quid divorti fuit:
asini me mordicibus scindant, boves incursent cornibus.
Hoc magnum est periculum, ab asinis ad boves transcendere.

But, if this is the thought of *Ru.* 485–490, Lucian *De Mercede Conductis*, 23, is not in point, for nothing is said there to the effect that "*Libertas* never enters the house of a rich man". There to the man who plans to work for pay these words are spoken: καὶ πρῶτόν γε μέμνησο μηκέτι ἐλεύθερον τὸ ἀπ' ἐκείνου μηδὲ εὐπατρίδην σεαυτὸν οἶσθαι· πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα, τὸ γένος, τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, τοὺς προγόνους ἔξω τοῦ ὁδοῦ καταλείψων ἴσθι, ἐπειδὴν ἐπὶ τοιαύτην σεαυτὸν λατρείαν ἀπεμπολήσας εἰσίσῃς· οὐ γὰρ ἐβελήσῃ σοι ἡ Ἐλευθερία ξυνεσελθεῖν ἐφ' οὕτως ἀγεννῇ πράγματα καὶ ταπεινὰ εἰσιόντι. Δοῦλος οὖν, εἰ καὶ πάννυχθ' ὀνόματι, καὶ οὐχ ἑνός, ἀλλὰ πολλῶν δοῦλος ἀναγκαίως ἔσῃ καὶ θητεύσεις κάτω νενευκῶς ἔωθεν εἰς ἐσπέραν, "ἀεικελίῃ ἐπὶ μισθῷ" Plainly, Lucian's words throw light on our passage only by showing that *Libertas* was particular about the company she kept.

Manifestly, no convincing guess concerning the meaning of our passage has yet been made. If another may be added, I would suggest as a sufficient thought here, whether it was that of Diphilus and Plautus or not, the idea that *Libertas* was loath to set foot on shipboard or anywhere else with one so overmastering as *Hercules* had shown himself to be.

In Ru. 798 ff. *Daemones senex* sends *Turbalio servos* to bring from the house two stout *clavae*. When *Turbalio* comes back with the clubs, *Daemones* says (804) *Ehem, optume edepol eccum clavator advenit*; at 807-808 he bids *Turbalio* and *Sparax*, each with a club, to stand on either side of *Labrax leno*, to keep him from molesting the girls and from going away. Finally, when we remember that the scene is laid before a *fanum Veneris*, we shall understand *Labrax's* words at 821 ff.: *Heu hercle ne istic fana mutantur cito: iam hoc Herculi fit Veneris fanum quod fuit: ita duo destituit signa hic cum clavis senex*.

I group here minor references to *Hercules*.—In Cu. 358 *Curculio parasitus* says: *talos arripio, invoco almam meam nutricem Herculem, iacto basilicum*. Between *Hercules*, of the large appetite, and a parasite sympathy was sure to exist. See *Naudet's* note.—In St. 218 ff. *Gelasimus parasitus* is auctioning his property, his *logi ridiculi*. In 221 ff. he cries, *Age, licemini. Qui cena poscit? ecqui poscit prandio? (Hercules te amabit)—prandio, cena tibi. Ehem, adnuistin?* But the text here is uncertain: see *Lindsay*. The passage closes with 232-233: *Haec veniisse iam opus est quantum potest, uti decumam partem Herculi polluceam*. See *Naudet's* note. For tithes to *Hercules* see also Ba. 663-666 (*servos*), Mo. 984 (? *servos*), and, best of all, Tru. 559-565 (*servos*).—In Ru. 1225, *Daemones senex*, having been worsted by *Trachalio servos* in their duel of *licet's*, exclaims, *Hercules istum infelicet cum sua licentia*.

Hippolyta.—See above, page 247, under *Hercules*.

Hyacinthus.—In Ba. 109 ff. *Lydus paedagogus* seeks to deter *Pistoclerus adulescens* from entering *Bacchis's* house. Finally, in 137 ff., we have this dialogue:

PI. Tace atque sequere, Lyde, me. LY. Illuc sis vide!
non paedagogum iam me, sed Lydum vocat.

PI. Non par videtur neque sit consentaneum,
 quom † haec intus † sit et cum amica accubet,
 quomque osculetur et convivae alii accubent,
 praesentibus illis paedagogus ut siet.

Havet, according to Lindsay, suggested, in verse 140, cum *παῖς* intus sit et cum cum amica accubet. Lindsay himself thinks that quom Hyacinthus intus sit may be right, but he does not indicate wherein a reference to Hyacinthus would be appropriate here. He was doubtless thinking of the erotic version of the Hyacinthus story.

Icarus.—In Mer. 486–489 Naudet saw a reference to the story of Icarus:

EU. Visne eam ad portum—CH. Qui potius quam voles? EU. atque
 eximam

mulierem pretio? CH. Qui potius quam auro expendas? EU. Unde
 erit?

CH. Achillem orabo aurum mihi det Hector qui expensus fuit.

EU. Sanun es?

Charinus is throughout sarcastic. The ultimate sense of the passage is as follows: 'Do you want me to go (walk) to the harbor ———?' 'No, fly.'—'and get the woman by paying for her?' 'Why, of course, buy her'. 'Where's the money to come from?' 'Oh, I'll ask Achilles to give me the money he got as ransom for Hector'. Charinus's two answers mean in the last analysis: 'of course you've got to walk, *you* can't fly', and 'pay for her, in gold, of course'. The allusion to the Achilles story increases somewhat the possibility that Naudet is right in seeing a reference to the Icarus story: the allusions that concern us come *catervatim*, so to say; see e. g. above, page 243, under Argus, the passages referred to page 238, note 1, and below, pages 258–260, under Ulixes.

Linus.—See above, under Hercules, page 247.

Lycurgus (insanus).—See above, under Ajax, page 238.

Medea, Pelias.—In Ps. 790–865 Ballio leno is abusing a cocus whom he has hired *a foro*. The latter, unruffled, bids Ballio stop worrying, adding (868 ff.) sorbitione faciam ego hodie te mea item ut Medea Peliam concoxit senem, quem medicamento et suis venenis dicitur fecisse rusus ex sene adolescentulum: item ego te faciam. See the editors ad loc., especially Morris.

Minerva.—In Hau. 1035–1037, in a dialogue between Clitipho adulescens and Chremes, his father, there is an interesting use of the story of Minerva's birth:

CL. Non sunt haec parentis dicta. CH. Non, si ex capite sis meo natus, item ut aiunt Minervam esse ex Iove, ea causa magis patiar, Clitipho, flagitiis tuis me infamem fieri.

Mulciber.—See below, under Achilles, page 255.

Nerio.—In Tru. 515 Stratophanes miles, entering, addresses Phronesium meretrix thus: Mars peregre adveniens salutatur Nerienem uxorem suam. See Gellius 13. 21, especially 11 ff.

Oedipus.—In Andr. 194 Davus servos, pretending not to understand the hint his master is trying to give him, says Davus sum, non Oedipus. In Poe. 443–444 Milphio says of his master's wild utterances, isti quidem hercle orationi Oedipo opus coniectore, qui Sphingi interpretis fuit.

Omphale.—See Eun. 1026 ff., Men. 795 ff., cited above, under Hercules, page 248.

Ops.—In Mi. 1082 the miles says: postriduo natus sum ego, mulier, quam Iuppiter ex Ope natust. Compare Cis. 512 ff., where Alcesimarchus adulescens says, with interruptions by Melaenis lena:

itaque me Iuno regina et Iovis supremi filia,
itaque me Saturnus eius patruos—ME. Ecaster pater.

AL. itaque me Ops opulenta, illius avia—ME. Immo mater quidem.

The Miles passage helps us to see that *eius* and *illius* refer to Jupiter. In Pe. 251 ff. Sagaristio servos, entering, appeals to *Iovi opulento, incluto, Ope gnato*, etc. Brix, on Mi. l. c., refers to Livy 39. 22. 4, and the editors there. See also Preller-Jordan, *Römische Mythologie* 3, 2. 20 ff.

Orestes.—See above, page 238.

Orpheus-Eurydice.—See above, under Orcus, page 237.

Pentheus.—In Mer. 469 Charinus adulescens, entering, says: Pentheum diripuisse aiunt Bacchas: nugas maxumas fuisse credo, praeut quo pacto ego divorsus distrahor. Cf. also a fragment, incomplete, of the *Vidularia*: Eiusdem Bacchae fecerunt nostram navem Pentheum.

Phaon.—In Mi. 1246–1247 Palaestrio servos says to the miles: nulli mortali scio optigisse hoc nisi duobus, tibi et Phaoni Lesbio, tam mulier se ut amaret.

Philomela, Progne.—In Ru. 593 ff. Daemones senex, entering, soliloquizes concerning a dream of the past night (596–

597). A *simia* had been trying to reach a *nidus hirundininus*, but in vain; finally it had sought to borrow a ladder from *Daemones* (598-602). Compare now 603 ff.: ego ad hoc exemplum simiae respondeo . . . natas ex Philomela ac Progne esse hirundines: ago cum illa ne quid noceat meis popularibus.¹ See also, below, on this page, under Tereus.

Phoenix.—See above, under Hercules, page 247.

Phrixus.—In Ba. 239-243 Chrysalus servos refers in a very interesting way to the story of the *aries Phrixi* (*extexam* ego illum pulchre iam, si di volunt, in 239 paves the way very naturally for 241-242).

Porthaon.—In Men. 745 Menaechmus II Syracusanus, addressing the matrona, says: Ego te simitu novi cum Porthaone. Cf. his words to her at 748: Novi cum Calcha simul.

Rhadamanthus.—In Tr. 928 the sycophanta, master supreme of tall talk, when asked to give Charmides's whereabouts, says: Pol illum reliqui ad Rhadamantem in Cercopio. See Brix and Fairclough ad loc.

Sibulla.—In Ps. 25-26 Pseudolus servos says of the letter written by the meretrix to Calidorus adulescens: has quidem pol credo nisi Sibulla legerit, interpretari alium potesse neminem.

Sisyphus.—In Eun. 1084-1085 Gnatho parasitus has the Sisyphus story in mind: Unum etiam hoc vos oro, ut me in vestrum gregem recipiatis: satis diu hoc iam saxum vorso. The *saxum* is the miles. See Donatus and Fabia ad loc.

Sphinx.—See above, under *Oedipus*, page 252.

Tereus.—See under Philomela, Progne, pages 252 f. In Ru. 508-509 Charmides senex, the voluptuous Sicilian friend of Labrax leno, says to Labrax: Scelestiozem cenam cenavi tuam quam quae Thyestae quondam aut posita est Tereo.

Thyestes.—See above, under Tereus.

Titanes.—In Pe. 26 Toxilus servos asks: Quid ego faciam? disne advorser? quasi Titani cum is belligerem quibus sat esse non queam?²

¹ Compare the appeal of Epops in Aristophanes, Aves 366-368 to the birds to spare Peisthetaerus and Euelpides, τῆς ἐμῆς γυναίκος ὄντε ἐγγυρεῖ καὶ φυλέτα.

² In Men. 853 f. Menaechmus II Syracusanus, pretending to be mad, says, Hau male illanc amovi: <amoveo> nunc hunc inpurissimum,

Volcanus.—In Ru. 761 Labrax leno, after *Daemones* has forbidden him to touch the maidens, says: *Volcanum adducam, is Venerist advorsarius*. For the story he has in mind compare e. g. *Odyssey* 8. 270–365. See Naudet's note. See also above, under *Mulciber*, page 252.

Miscellaneous Matters.—In Pe. 549 ff. *Sagaristio servos* is talking to the *virgo* whom he is bringing in as a supposed prisoner of war; he asks her opinion of Athens and receives a clever answer (549–550). In 553–554 we have this further dialogue: *SAG. Ut munitum muro tibi visum oppidumst? VI. Si incolae bene sunt morati, id pulchre moenitum arbitror, etc.* There may be a reference to Sparta and its human walls. In Tr. 547–552 there is an elaborate reference to the *Fortunatorum Insulae*. In As. 34, in the words of *Libanus servos, apud fustitudinas, ferricrepinas insulas*, I see a parodic reference again to these Islands.

B. STORIES RELATING TO THE TROJAN WAR (INVOLVING HOMER AND THE CYCLIC POETS).¹

Attention was called, p. 232, n. 3, to the rôle played by the story of Troy in early Roman tragedy. Comedy, too, was interested in this theme. At any rate, we find in Plautus (though not in Terence) references repeatedly to well-known details of the story still to be seen in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, but which, in the days when the so-called Cyclic Poems were yet extant, was far more fully rounded out for both Greeks and Romans than it can be for us.

Achilles.—In Tru. 730–731 *Astaphium ancilla* says to *Diniarchus adulescens*: *Stultus es qui facta infecta facere verbis postules. Theti' quoque etiam lamentando pausam fecit filio.*

barbatum, tremulum *Titanum* qui cluet *Cycno* patre. So Lindsay, and Brix-Niemeyer¹, with the MSS, rightly. Most editors read *Tithonum* for *Titanum*. But they are obliged to admit that nowhere else is *Tithonus* son of *Cycnus*. This consideration would, of course, be without weight if the MSS gave *Tithonum*; in this very play, 141–143, as shown above, page 246, note 2, we have a story without parallel in extant classical literature.

¹ To get the properly cumulative effect, it has seemed best to group under this one caption all the pertinent material.

Epid. 29-38 is a very interesting passage. Two slaves are talking, Thesprio, slave of Stratippocles, who has just come back from Thebes from some campaign, and Epidicus:

EP. Ubi arma sunt Stratippocli?

TH. Pol illa ad hostis transfugerunt. EP. Armane? TH. Atque quidem cito.

EP. Serione dici' tu?

TH. Serio, inquam: hostes habent.

EP. Edepol facinus inprobum. TH. At iam ante alii fecerunt idem¹.

Erit illi illa res honori. EP. Qui? TH. Quia ante aliis fuit².

Mulciber, credo, arma fecit quae habuit Stratippocles:

travolaverunt ad hostis³. EP. Tum ille prognatus Theti sine perdat: alia adportabunt ei Neri filiae.

Id modo videndum est, ut materies suppetat scutariis, si in singulis stipendiis is ad hostis exuvias dabit⁴.

In Mi. 59 ff. Artotrogus parasitus tells how the day before some women had questioned him concerning the miles. Cf. 61 ff.:

AR. Rogitabant: "Hicine Achilles est?", inquit mihi.

"Immo eius frater"⁵, inquam, "est". Ibi illarum altera

"Ergo mecator pulcher est" inquit mihi,

"et liberalis. Vide caesaries quam decet".

Cf. also 68. In Mi. 1054a, 1055 Milphidippa ancilla calls the soldier Mi Achilles . . . urbicae, occisor regum. In Mi.

¹ Leo and Lindsay rightly keep the MS order of the verses.

² Gray ad loc. holds that "this probably alludes to some well-known persons who had undeservedly received promotion. They are the *βυζαντινοί* of Aristophanes, Nub. 353, Pax 1186". Scaliger and Naudet had held this view long before: see the note in the Lemaire edition. Certainly the passage sounds definite enough; it would at any rate be far more effective if aimed at contemporary events. In that case, see above, page 243, note 1, page 244, note 1.

It strikes me, however, that we may have here after all rather a parody of passages like those in Archilochus, Alcaeus, and Anacreon to which Horace's famous phrase, *relicta non bene parmula*, C. 2. 7. 10, goes back. See Smith's note there.

³ The sense is 'No human workman made those arms: they had wings'. There is here, of course, a *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke; Vulcan made arms for Achilles (and for Aeneas) for fighting, not for flight, if the *lusus verborum* may be allowed.

⁴ For the language cf. Juvenal 3. 310-311.

⁵ Wild burlesque, of course; Achilles had no brother. In the Iliad Achilles is long-haired, and *ξανθός*. See Seymour, Life in the Homeric Age, 175-177.

1284 ff. Pleusicles adulescens, entering in the disguise of a *nauclerus*, moralizes on the strange conduct to which love has driven men, himself included. At 1289, he begins his enumeration of these things with the words *Mitto iam ut occidi Achilles civis passus est*. See *Mer.* 486 ff., discussed above, under *Icarus*, page 251.

Alexander (Paris).—In *Mi.* 777–778 *Palaestrio servos* says of the miles, *Isque Alexandri praestare praedicat formam suam*. See also below, pages 259–260, the analysis of the contents of *Ba.* 925 ff.

Autolycus.—In *Ba.* 275 *Nicobulus senex* refers to *Autolycus*, grandfather of *Ulysses*, *furacitate celeberrimus*, thus: *Deceptus sum: Autolyco hospiti aurum credidi*.

Calchas.—In *Men.* 748–749 the dialogue between the *matrona* and *Menaechmus II Syracusanus* runs thus (she refers to her father):

MA. *Novistin tu illum?* MEN. *Novi cum Calcha simul:
eodem die illum vidi quo te ante hunc diem.*

Cf. his words at 745, *Ego te simitu novi cum Porthaone*. In *Mer.* 945, after *Charinus*, crazed by love, had told *Eutychus* that he had traveled in search of his lost love to *Chalcis* and there had got information concerning her from a *hospes Zacyntho* (940–944), the latter exclaims, *Calchas iste quidem Zacynthiust*.

Hecuba.—*Hecuba's* story, in one detail at least, was in *Plautus's* mind in several passages. Witness the interesting dialogue in *Men.* 713–718 between the *matrona* and *Menaechmus II Syracusanus*, in which *Menaechmus* refers to the story of *Hecuba's* transformation into a dog (for which cf. e. g. *Euripides, Hecuba* 1265). Cf. 936. Possibly, too, *Plautus* had this story in mind in *Cas.* 317–320 (dialogue between *Lysidamus senex* and *Olumpio servos*):

LY. *Quid istuc est? quicum litigas, Olumpio?*
OL. *Cum eadem qua tu semper.* LY. *Cum uxori mea?*
OL. *Quam tu mihi uxorem? quasi venator tu quidem es,
dies atque noctes cum cane aetatem exigis.*

Yet *cane* in 320 may be merely a common term of opprobrium and 319–320 may remind us rather of *Horace C. I. I. 25–28*.

For another reference to Hecuba see below, pages 259-260, in the discussion of Ba. 925 ff.

Hector.—In Cas. 991 ff., when Olumpio vilicus turns on his master, Lysidamus senex, this dialogue ensues:

LY. Non taces? OL. Non hercle vero taceo. Nam tu maxumo
me opsecravisti opere Casinam ut poscerem uxorem mihi
tui amoris caussa. LY. Ego istuc feci? OL. Immo Hector Ilius—
LY. te quidem oppresset¹.

The Teubner text had printed *Immo Hector Ilius te quidem oppressit*, and had distributed the dialogue differently; the sentence *Immo . . . oppressit* was allotted to Cleustrata matrona. Lindsay refers to Palmer, *Hermathena* 12. 83. Lindsay's text and distribution of parts are excellent. Olumpio starts to say, sarcastically, 'No, I didn't do it, Trojan Hector <did it>'. The sarcasm is of a piece with that seen e. g. in Men. 748-749 MA. Novistin tu illum? MEN. Novi cum Calcha simul: eodem die illum vidi quo te ante hunc diem. See also Men. 745 Ego te simitu novi cum Porthaone. For another reference to Hector see above, under Icarus, page 251.

Iphigenia.—In Epid. 488-490 there is probably a reference, in the dialogue between the miles and the senex, to the Iphigenia story:

MI. Em istic homo te articulatim concidit, senex,
tuo' servos. PE. Quid 'concidit'? MI. Sic suspiciost,
nam pro fidicina haec cerva supposita est tibi.

See Gray ad loc.

Nestor.—In Men. 934 ff. the Medicus and the senex talk thus about Menaechmus II Syracusanus:

MED. Nunc homo insanire oceptat: de illis verbis cave tibi.
SE. Immo Nestor nunc quidem est de verbis, praeut dudum fuit.

Penelope.—In St. 1-9 there is a most elaborate reference to Penelope's sorrow because of the long absence of Ulysses (the speaker, Panegyris, has heard nothing of her husband in more than two years: see 29-36): Credo ego miseram fuisse Penelopam, soror, suo ex animo, quae tam diu vidua viro suo caruit, nam nos eius animum de nostris factis noscimus, quarum viri hinc apsunt, quorumque nos negotiis apsentum, ita ut aequom est, sollicitae noctes et dies, soror, sumus semper.

¹ This sort of interruption is frequent in the Casina.

Talthybius.—In St. 274 ff. Pinacium, rather tipsy¹ (270 ff.), is bringing good news to his mistress. In 305 ff. he cries, *contundam facta Talthubi contemnamque omnis nuntios simulque ad cursuram meditabor me ad ludos Olumpios*.

Ulixes.—In plays in which the chief rôle is borne by the tricky slave we should naturally expect references to Ulixes.²

In Ba. 21–23, among the fragments of this play, we have a reference to the sorrows of Ulixes, particularly to the sorrows caused by his wanderings (the words are spoken, apparently, by one of the Bacchides):

*Ulixem audivi fuisse aerumnosissimum
qui annos viginti errans a patria afuit;
verum hic adulescens multo Ulixem anteit < fide >
qui ilico errat intra muros civicos*³.

In Ba. 925–978 there is a long parody, in general of many Greek and Latin plays portraying the fall of Troy and its consequences, in particular, I suspect, of Ennius; the parody is uttered by Chrysalus servos. In this Ulixes has a place more than once. Compare 940 ff.: *Ego sum Ulixes, quouis consilio haec gerunt; 946 miles Menelaust, ego Agamemno, idem Ulixes Lartius; 949 ff. nam illi (=adv., 'there,' i. e. at Troy) itidem Ulixem audivi, ut ego sum, fuisse et audacem et malum: dolis ego deprensus sum, ille mendicans paene inventus interit, dum ibi exquirat fata Iliorum; adsimiliter mi hodie optigit; vinctus sum, sed dolis me exemi: item se ille servavit dolis; 962 ff. ibi vix me exsolvi: atque id periculum adsimilo, Ulixem ut praedicant cognitum ab Helena esse proditum Hecubae; sed, ut olim ille se blanditiis exemit et persuasit se ut amitteret, item ego dolis me illo extuli e periculo et decepi senem*. Cf. p. 239.

¹ See the discussion of this passage in my paper, *References to Painting in Plautus and Terence*, *Classical Philology*, XII, 151–152.

² On this conception of Ulixes as a feature of Greek tragedy see Conington, *Vergil*,⁴ 2. xxxvi. Such a conception, of course, suited the Romans as descendants of the Trojans: see Conington, *ibid.* xxiv–xxvii.

³ The passage is cited by Charisius, to illustrate *ilico* (the word seems to mean 'forthwith', i. e. even before he leaves his patria). *fide* in 23 is due to Leo; Lindsay reads it, but doubtfully. I have not been able to see how the word can be fitted into the context. What we need is a dissyllabic word meaning 'wandering' or 'trouble'. Professor Paul Nixon, in his text and translation (1916), omits *fide*: evidently to him too it was meaningless. For the passage as a whole compare St. 1–9, quoted above, under Penelope, page 257.

In Ps. 1063-1064 *Simo senex*, entering, says: *Visso quid rerum meus Ulixes egerit, iamne habeat signum ex arce Ballionia*. *Pseudolus*, of course, is here *Ulixes*, and the *signum* (the *Palladium*) is the girl owned by *Ballio*. Again, in 1243-1244, *Simo* says of *Pseudolus*: *Nimis illic mortalis doctus, nimis vorsutus, nimis malus; superavit dolum Troianum atque Ulixem Pseudolus*.¹

In *Men.* 899 ff. *Menaechmus I Epidamniensis*, for whom things have turned out badly, entering, says: *Edepol ne hic dies pervorsus atque advorsus mi optigit: quae me clam ratus sum facere, omnia ea fecit palam parasitus qui me complevit flagiti et formidinis, meus Ulixes, suo qui regi tantum concivit mali*.²

I group here several very general references. In *Mi.* 1025 *Milphidippa ancilla* calls the soldier *Ilium*, thus: *quo pacto hoc Ilium appelli velis, id fero ad te consilium*. So in the fine parody in *Ba.* 925 ff. the *senex* of the play is referred to as *Ilium* (945, 948, 972), and as *Priamus* (978). In *Mi.* 740 ff. *Pleusicles adulescens*, praising *Periplecomenus senex* for his hospitality, declares that usually when a guest is three days together at one's house *east odiorum Ilias* (743). In *Tru.* 482 ff. *Stratophanes miles*, entering, declares that he will not, as many others have done, recount his battles: *scio ego multos memoravisse milites mendacium: et Homerionida et postilla mille memorari potest, qui et convicti et condemnati falsis de pugnis sient* (see also the following lines).³

Finally, as the climax of this paper, I take up again a passage to which I have already often referred, *Ba.* 925-978, the best of all parodies in *Plautus*, spoken by *Chrysalus servos*. It is impossible to do this passage justice. Lack of space forbids the

¹ I think at once of *Livius Andronicus's* line: *Virum mihi, Camena, insece vorsutum*. On this verse see my remarks in *A. J. P.*, XXXV 17-19; XXXIX 109.

² *Brix-Niemeyer*⁴ think here of *Ulixes's* "üble Dienste bei Iphigeniens Opferung (*Eurip. Iph. Aul.* 524. 1361), wodurch die Verfeindung zwischen *Agamemnon* und seiner Gattin entstand".

³ I am reminded here of the Greek debate on the question, Is the absolute truth to be demanded of the poet? See *W. R. Hardie, Lectures on Classical Subjects*, 267-268, 283. *Plautus's* words are interesting, too, when put beside what is said—e. g. by *Cicero* and *Gellius*—of the liberties accorded to rhetoricians: compare *Gellius*, *N. A.* i. 6. 4-5.

quotation of the whole (it is reinforced by later allusions in the play: see 979 ff.); to discuss in detail every point raised by it would be at once too lengthy and needless. Some indication of the richness of this passage for our purposes may, however, be afforded even by a bare catalogue of the names which appear within it: Achilles, 938; Agamemnon, 946; Alexander (=Paris), 947; Atridae, 925; Epius, 937; Hecuba, 963; Helena, 948, 963; Ilium, 945, 948, 951, 956, 972 (987); Menelaus, 946; the Palladium, 954, 958; Pergamum, 926, 933 (1053, 1054); Priamus, 926, 933, 973, 976, 978; Sinon, *relictus . . . in busto Achilli*, 937; Sinon's fire-signal, 939; Troia, 933 (1053, 1058); Troilus, 954, 960; Ulixes, 940, 949-952, 962-965; the 1000 ships, 928; the wooden horse, 936, 941; the tria fata of Troy, 953 ff., 959 (987); the breaking through of the *portae Phrygiae limen superum*, 955 (987).

V. REFERENCES TO PHILOSOPHERS.

Socrates, Solon, Thales.—In Ps. 464-465 Simo senex, speaking to Callipho senex, says of Pseudolus servos: *Conficiet iam te hic verbis ut tu censeas non Pseudolum, sed Socratem tecum loqui.* See Morris ad loc. The tone here is not so plainly sarcastic as is that of the references to Thales (see below). In As. 598-600 Libanus servos says sarcastically of his younger master Argyrippus: *Audin hunc opera ut largus est nocturna? nunc enim esse negotiosum interdus videlicet Solonem, leges ut conscribat quibus se populus teneat.* Witness the following dialogue, from Ba. 120-124, between Pistoclerus adulescens and Lydus paedagogus:

LY. An deus est ullus Suavisaviatio?

PL. An non putasti esse umquam? O Lyde, es barbarus¹:
quem ego sapere nimio censui plus quam Thalem,
is stultior es barbaro poticio . . .

In Cap. 274-276 Tyndarus servos, commenting on the interview between Hegio and Philocrates, exclaims: *Eugepae! Thalem talento non emam Milesium, nam ad sapientiam huius <hominis> nimius nugator fuit.* In Ru. 1003 two slaves, Trachalio, and Gripus, talk thus: TR. *Stultus es.* GR. *Salve,*

¹ For the *lusus verborum* here cf. Cu. 150.

Thales. In 986 Gripus had already derisively addressed Trachalio with the word *Philosophe*.¹

CHARLES KNAPP.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

¹ For a similar reference to Thales in Greek comedy see e. g. Aristophanes, Aves 1009 *ἄνθρωπος θαλῆς* (said of Meton). See the editors there, especially Van Leeuwen. The tone in all the references in Plautus to Socrates, Solon, and Thales, it will be noted, is sarcastic. We may compare other passages in which there is allusion to philosophy, though no philosopher is named. In Cap. 284 Tyndarus, overhearing Philocrates's remark about Orcus (see above, page 237), says: *Salva res est: philosophatur quoque iam, non mendax modo est*. To Tyndarus, *philosophia* was the quintessence of lying. Cf. also Mer. 147-148 (*Acanthio servos*): *Nescio ego istaec: philosophari* ('refine', 'split hairs') *numquam didici neque scio*; Ps. 687 (*Pseudolus servos*, who had been philosophizing since 675) *Sed iam satis est philosophatum: nimi' diu et longum loquor*; Ps. 974 (*Pseudolus*, commenting on his master's remark, in foro vix decumus quisque est qui ipse sese noverit) *Salvos sum, iam philosophatur*.

It would be easy, especially in view of passages in Cicero's works (e. g. *De Fin.* 1. 1) which show Roman opposition to philosophy, and in view of the still more significant fact that Cicero repeatedly makes elaborate apologies for devoting himself to philosophy (see Reid, *Academica*, 23, note), to suppose that in the passages cited in this note Plautus was reflecting Roman rather than Grecian views of philosophy. But let us recall how in *Anabasis* 2. 1. 13, in answer to Theopompus's labored effort to show why the Greeks should not surrender their arms to the King, Phalinus *ἔγχεσε καὶ εἶπεν*, 'Ἀλλὰ φιλοσόφῳ μὲν ἔοικας, ὦ νεανίσκε, καὶ λέγεις οὐκ ἀχάριστα. ἴσθι μέντοι ἀνόητος ὢν, εἰ οἶσι τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀρετὴν περιγενέσθαι ἀν τῆς βασιλέως δυνάμεως.

II. THE USE AND RANGE OF THE FUTURE PARTICIPLE.

The Future Participle in Latin abounds in interest alike to the student of Morphology, of Syntax, and of Style. Tho there may be some doubt regarding the circumstances attending its birth and that of its associates,¹ there can be little doubt regarding the multiplicity and variety of its stylistic activities when once it attained its maturity. In the complexity of its

¹For the divergent views regarding the origin of the fut. part. and of the fut. infin. cf. Stolz, *Formenlehre* (1910), pp. 299 and 297. It is to be noted that Sommer, who in the 1st ed. of his *Handbuch*, p. 649, had held the view that 'the fut. part. was probably in the highest degree derived from the fut. infin.', in the 3d ed. (1914), p. 612, says: "eine sichere Erklärung der Bildung auf *-urus* fehlt", and on p. 595 refers to Postgate's view of the origin of the fut. infin. as "nicht frei von Bedenken". It should also be noted that Postgate, *Class. Rev.* XVIII (1904), p. 455, says: "on the whole I am inclined to believe that the fut. part. and the fut. infin. are of independent origin". Cf. also Kühner-Holzweissig, I (1912), pp. 696 and 706, and Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.*, pp. 537 and 540, and Sjögren, *Zum Gebr. des Futurums* (1906), p. 197. The last-named scholar says: "die sog. coniugatio periphrastica auf *-urus sum*, deren Herkunft noch unaufgeklärt ist." However, for the purposes of this investigation it has seemed advisable to proceed from the assumption that the various steps in the development of the fut. part. were somewhat as follows, using *facturus* as an illustration: to the indeclinable fut. infin. *facturum* was added, after the analogy of *factum esse*, an *esse*: from the indeclinable form *facturum esse* was developed, after the analogy of *factum*, *-am*, *-um esse*, a declinable *facturum*, *-am*, *-um esse*. This was not only an easy step from the preceding but an important one, inasmuch as from the first part, an accusative, could easily be formed a nominative, *facturus*, *-a*, *-um*, from the *esse* could easily arise an *est*, and from the combination of the two, *facturus*, *-a*, *um est*, i. e. the First Periphrastic combination, being assisted in its birth by such forms as *factus*, *-a*, *um est*. This new combination was soon widely used and given various meanings, and when, through the not uncommon ellipsis of *est* in other combinations, the independent form *facturus*, *-a*, *-um* came into existence, which had a parallel in the independent form *factus*, *-a*, *-um*, it assumed not only the various shades of meaning found in the first periphrastic and in the other participles, but took on others also.

nature, in the range of its use, in the versatility of the rôles it assumes, it stands unrivaled among the other parts of speech. "In its life it plays many parts," as many and as varied, one may almost say, as are the feelings and emotions. This is its striking characteristic. The addition of the personal touch to the narrative, the appeal to the interest and sympathy of the reader, the introduction of the dramatic element, the feeling of suspense, of uncertainty regarding the final accomplishment of the purpose announced, all combine to make the Future Participle one of the most effective means of adding life and interest to the style.

For centuries, however, the stylistic possibilities of the future participle lay dormant.¹ With the appearance of Ovid came the great awakening. As a master of technique, with the vision of the artist, he saw its latent possibilities, and straightway there were given to the Latin world many new and varied nuances of expression. His gifted contemporary, Livy, was also alive to its possibilities, and in the hands of these two artists² the future participle was brought to its highest development.

The varied uses of the future participle followed two different lines of development, depending upon the character of the creative impulse. The one may be designated as subjective, the other objective; in the one the action is voluntary, within the control of the actor, in the other involuntary, beyond his control; or to still vary the phrase, in the one, the force is acting from within, in the other, acting from without. On the subjective side, we may express in English³ its force by saying

¹ According to Bennett, *Synt. of Early Latin*, I, p. 435, but two occurrences of this usage are found in this period, one in Plaut. (a Grecism), the other in C. Gracchus.

² Kühner,³ II, I. p. 760, disregards Ovid's usage and says "seit Livius". Of Livy it may be said that he used it from choice, for its stylistic effect, while in the case of Ovid it should be noted that the fut. part. often furnished him with a convenient rhythmical form. Notice the frequent use of it in the fifth and sixth feet. Cf. *futurus* p. 283.

³ Whether the fut. part. was as carefully analyzed and differentiated in the Roman mind as the above analysis would indicate cannot in the very nature of the case be said with certainty. It is believed, however, that these different forces were actually felt and that the various shades of meaning in their Latin equivalents were present in his mind.

that the person was first represented as 'being about to' perform an action, and from this was developed, 'going to, on the point of, soon to, with the intention of,' becoming, with a slight shift, 'likely to, ready to, prepared to, able to'; then assuming a stronger force, 'determined to', 'resolved to', and finally denoting, 'with the purpose of', expressing the purpose of the action. From the objective side the reverse ideas were developed, the action now being represented as, 'with a tendency to, destined to, doomed to,' and finally having the equivalence of a subordinate clause, 'that is to, that should' etc., or even of a principal clause. The germs of some of these uses of the fut. part. were already present in its use with *est*, but not, it is to be noted, in its use with *esse*. In other words the "first periphrastic", and not the infinitive, had an influence in the development of the various uses and shades of meaning of the future participle as such.

I. THE FUTURE PARTICIPLE WITH ESSE.

Here the facts of usage speak in no uncertain tones. The frequent and widespread "omission" of *esse* shows that it was not considered a vital and essential part of the future infinitive. The combined usage of Plautus and Terence¹ shows the form without *esse* in about 80% of the total number of occurrences. In classical prose the same percentage prevails (without *esse* 1070, with *esse* 265), and in the prose of the Silver Age the omission is even greater, 92% (without 2035, with 172). It is to be further noted that the form with *esse* was never used by the poets, with but two exceptions, Ovid (Pont. 4. 6. 26, a pentameter) and Martial (8. 81. 9, a Phalaecean). It is also significant that the following prose writers do not use the form with *esse* at all: Sallust² (Cat., Jug. (53); but Ep. Mith. 10: *urum esse*); Hirtius (7); Nepos (73); Varro, L. L. (2); Vitruvius (4); Bell. Afr. (14); Vell. (22); Mela (1); Frontinus (32); and Tacitus (110). The fact that the form with *esse* is read but once, contrary to the general usage, in the latest texts, renders its occurrence suspicious, if not doubtful, in

¹ For these two writers both Sjögren, p. 96, and Postgate adopt Leopold's statistics: without *esse* 174 times, with *esse* 44 times.

² The number of times each uses the form without *esse* is put in parenthesis.

Sen., Contr. 7. 6. 15 (79); Val. Max. 6. 5. 2 (47; Halm reads *sese*); Petron. 110 (18); Pliny, Nat. 9. 71 (30); Quint. 4. 2. 128 (40) [in Quint., Dec.: without *esse* 36, with *esse* 4 (*futurum*)] and Suet., Vesp. 5. 6 (*esset v. l.*) (77). In only two writers is the form with *esse* used oftener than that without *esse*, Bell. Hisp. (with: 13. 3; 19. 4; 5; 29. 6; without 19. 6; 22. 5) and Celsus (with 39. 35; 42. 9; 31; 52. 11 all *futurum*; without 35. 21; 85. 8). Cicero in his archaic *De Legibus* does not use *esse* at all; but, in general, in each of his other literary works the forms without *esse* amount to about 71%. Caesar's attitude toward these two forms is shown by the fact that he uses the form without *esse* in 93.1% of the total (164-12).¹ Livy's preference for the form without *esse* was similarly marked,² 90% (1101-107), and Pliny's, Ep. 90.1% (55-5); but these two writers are not so decided in their preference as Sen. phil., 96.5% (139-5), Apul. 96.4% (53-2) and Justin. 98.1% (104-2).³ The preference of Curt. 77.5% (103-30) and Gell. 77.3% (17-5) is not so marked.⁴

The use of the future infinitive belongs particularly to certain forms of literature, certain kinds of narrative resorting but little to indirect quotation. It is not used at all (excluding *fore* and *futurum*) by such poets as Lucr., Pers., and Juv.; but rarely by such as Sen. trag. (once in 430 pp.), Statius 4 (176.8 pp.);⁵ but more often by Lucan 4 (81. 5), Hor. 5 (52. 4), Catull. 2 (36. 5), Mart. 11 (31. 2), Verg. 15 (23. 7); and most often by Plaut. 144 (8. 6), Ter. 74 (4. 5), and Ovid 48 (19. 9). In prose it was used most rarely by such technical and impersonal writers as Celsus 2 (181), Vitruv. 3 (87),

¹Rice Holmes, *Caes.*, B. G. (1914), omits the *esse* in 5. 29. 2 and 7. 75. 5.

²In the *Periochae* the form with *esse* = 0, without = 11.

³In Sen. *esse* is used: Dial. 2. 3. 2; 11. 11. 1; Ben. 1. 10. 3; Ep. 59. 14; 117. 28; in Apul.: Phil. 62. 27; 93. 12; in Just. 6. 3. 7; 21. 1. 2; in Gell. 2. 24. 2; 6. 18. 3; 12. 11. 2; 13. 24; 13. 5. 4.

⁴It may be noted here that the list of citations for the use of the protasis in the Abl. Abs. given by Kühner³, II, 1, p. 776, is far from complete; cf. e. g. Cic., Att. 1. 16. 5; 13. 27. 1; 31. 3; 15. 20. 4; Ovid, Met. 3. 287; Livy, 24. 18. 2, etc.

⁵The numbers in parenthesis indicate the rate of one occurrence per so many Teubner pages.

Varro, L. L. 2 (85. 5), and Pliny, Nat. 31 (61); most often by the historians, Nepos 73 (1. 5), Livy 1208 (1. 6), Caesar 176 (1. 9), Curtius 133 (2. 1), Sallust 53 (2. 3), Just. 106 (2. 3), Suet. 78 (3. 3), Tac. 110 (5. 5), Frontinus 32 (4. 5); but not so often by Florus 4 (26. 3). Cicero uses it most often in his Epist. 437 (2. 6), and Orat. 348 (4. 6); least often in Rhet. 56 (10. 2) and Phil. 138 (8. 2).¹

A. FUTURUM (ESSE) AND FORE.

Fore is in general used more often than *futurum*, its relative frequency being represented in Plaut. and Ter.² by 69%, in Classical Latin by 66%, and in the Silver Age by 63%. From the point of view of preference for one of these expressions the various writers may be classified under six categories. a) Those who use only *fore*: Hirtius (3), Varro, L. L. (2), Florus (1), Catullus (2), Tibullus (4), Val. Fl. (1) and Juvenal (1), all poets except one. b) Those who use only *futurum*: Vitruvius (3), Bell. Hisp. (1) and notably Sen. rhet. (22). c) Those, all poets, who use neither: Lygd. etc., Prop., Phaedrus, Sen. trag., Lucan, Persius, and Martial. d) Those who use *fore* oftener than *futurum*: Plaut. (48-22), Ter. (18-8), Sall. C., J., (26-1), Cic. (304-162), Caes. (39-15), Nepos (15-13), Bell. Afr. (5-2), Livy (277-101, decreasing from 78.2% in the 1st dec. to 61.1% in the 5th), Curt. (26-18), Pliny, Nat. (11-4), Quint. (10-6), Quint., Decl. (9-5), Gell. (5-2), Verg. (8-4), Hor. (6-1), Ovid (14-5), Sil. Ital. (4-1), Stat. (2-1). Of the eighteen writers who use both, the greatest contrast is shown in Tacitus, who uses *fore* 70 times to *futurum* only once. In all *fore* was used over twice (893) as often as *futurum* (372). e) Those who prefer *futurum* to *fore*, all prose and belonging to the Silver Age (exc. Lucr.): Vell. (3-1), Val. Max. (18-4), Celsus (2-1), Sen. phil. (33-4), Frontinus (4-2), Pliny, Ep. (9-6), Suet. (7-6), Just. (19-18), Apul. (14-7), and Lucr.

¹ *Fut. infin.*: Sen., Troad. 637; Stat., Th. 1. 343; 2. 199; 7. 765; 8. 792; Lucan, 5. 307; 8. 574; 9. 554; 555; Hor., C. 4. 9. 1; S. 1. 3. 123; Ep. 2. 1. 17; 226; 266; Catull. 36. 7; 42. 4; Vitruv., Pr. 3; 1. 1. 18; 10. 16. 7; Varro, L. L. 8. 51; 9. 115; Celsus, 35. 21; 85. 8.

² Cf. Sjögren, *l. c.* p. 57.

(4-3). f) Those who show no preference: one writer, Petronius (1-1).¹

B. FUTURUM² UT AND FORE UT.

These two expressions are in general used for rhetorical effect; i. e., from choice and not from necessity (on account of a missing supine stem).³ In the earlier period⁴ they were rarely used (Plaut., Ter.: 3); but in classical Latin they are used more freely, 102 times, most often by Cicero (70) and Caesar (14). In the Silver Age they are used only 76 times, notably by Sen. rhet. (10), Livy (10), and Tacitus (10). Their absence from poetry, except in Lucretius (4) and Ovid (2), is noteworthy.⁵ They are used relatively most frequently by Caes. (1 in 24. 3 pp.), Sen. rhet. (1 in 52. 6), and Cic. (1 in 63. 7). The opposite tendency is shown by Livy 10 (1 in 194. 6 pp.), Sen. phil. 1 (1 in 1496) and Pliny, Nat. (1 in 1892). In these three periods *fore ut*⁶ is used more often (132) than *futurum ut*⁷ (58), being represented in Plaut. and Ter. by 67%, in the Classical period by 87.3%, but in the Silver Age dropping to 42.1%.

Five categories are represented: a) Those using only *fore ut*: Plaut. (1), Sall. (5), Varro, L. L. (2), Vitruv. (2), Quint.

¹ Rarer occurrences: *futurum*, once: B. Hisp. 19. 4, Sall., Jug. 87. 4; Hor., Ep. 1. 7. 1; Sil. 17. 405; Stat., Th. 2. 199; Tac., Ann. 14. 48; Petron. 108; (Gell. 2. 16. 9; 29. 15); *fore*, once: Vell. 1. 12. 6; Celsus, 85. 9; Petron. 3; Val. Fl. 4. 476; Juv. 13. 200; Florus, 1. 1. 7.

² In this formula, it is to be noted, *futurum* appears without *esse*, except in Cic., De Div. 1. 101 and Caes., B. G. 1. 31, 11 (Kühner,² II, 1, p. 710, 8, needs revision).

³ To Kühner, *ibid.* p. 711, add: Nepos, 14. 6. 4; Livy, 41. 8. 7; Val. Max. 2. 9. 6; 7. 2 ext. 2; 8. 14 ext. 4; Celsus, 230. 35; Pliny, Nat. 17. 263; Tac., H. 3. 32. 17; Quint., Decl. 58. 24.

⁴ *Fore ut*: Plaut., Ps. 1319; Ter., Hec. 99; *futurum ut*: Ter., And. 508.

⁵ *Fore ut*: Lucr. 3. 486; 871; Ovid, Her. 16. 277; *futurum ut*: Lucr., 3. 871; 4. 805; Ovid, Am. 2. 18. 49.

⁶ *Fore ut*: note especially its use in Sall., J. 8. 1; 61. 4; 100. 1; 111. 1; 112. 3; Varro, L. L. 10. 51 *bis*; Vitruv. 2. 1. 3; 9 pr. 13; Quint. 6. 1. 29; Quint., Decl. 188. 31; Just. 5. 3. 3, and Gell. 5. 10. 9; 5. 1. 3; 9. 3. 5.

⁷ Note that Cicero uses *fut. ut* only twice (Caec. 4; De Div. 1. 101), Livy only 3 times (1. 53. 11; 9. 10. 5; 41. 8. 7), Tac. only once (Hist. 3. 32), Suet. only once (Aug. 97. 2). On the contrary Quint., Decl. uses *fore ut* only once (188. 31).

(1), Just. (1), and Gell. (3). b) Those using only *futurum ut*: Nepos (3), Sen. rhet. (10), Sen. phil. (1), Pliny, Nat. (1), Frontinus (3), and Pliny, Ep. (4). c) Those preferring *fore ut*: Cicero (68-2), Caes. (9-5), Livy (7-3), Tac. (9-1) and Suet. (7-1). d) Those preferring *futurum ut*: only one, Quint., Decl. (14-1). e) Those showing no preference: Ter. (1-1), Celsus (1-1), Ovid (1-1) and Lucr. (2-2).

Note also that *fore qui* is used by Sall., Jug. 43, *fore aliquem qui* by Cic., De Or. I. 95, *fore ne* begins with Celsus 95. 16 and Val. Max. 6. 4. 3, *futurum ne* with Val. Max. I. I. 8.

C. FORE AND FUTURUM WITH PARTICIPLES.¹

a) *Present*: cf. Kühner,² II, I. p. 159 and note: Cic., Fam. 14. 4. 6 quem spero fore observantem (part. adj.).

b) *Future*: not found until Late Latin and very rare; cf. *ib.* p. 163 and Schmalz, Synt.⁴ p. 463. For its use with *foret* cf. p. 276.

c) *Perfect* with *fore*: Several occurrences are to be added to Kühner, *ib.* p. 165: to the one cited from Plaut. add Cas. 54; and for Ter. (not cited) Hec. 398; to the 4 in Cic. (in Neue 23 cited), Verr. 2. I. 103; Piso 78 (i. e. in Orat. II, in Epist. 10); to 1 cited by both for Sall., Jug. 14. 4; 85. 26; to the 2 cited for Livy (5 by Neue), 2. 34. 11; 44. 3; 4. 6. 4; 5. 2. 3; 23. 44. 2; 26. 12. 13; 27. 16. 2; 43. 10. 2 (Livy, 13 in all). This usage is also found in Val. Max. 5. 6 ext. 4; Curt. 4. 7. 28; 29; Apul., Met. 251. 17; Phil. 185. 2 (in Ovid, A. A. I. 425, Caes. 4. 6. 3 and Hirt. 22. 2. part. adjs. are found).

With *futurum*: cited by both Neue and Kühner¹ in only one passage, Cic., Verr. I. 24. Note also its use in Plaut., Asin. 454 solutam futuram; Cic., Fam. 7. 16. 3 nummatum futurum.²

d) *Gerundive* with *fore*: forms like *mittendos fore* did not make their appearance until Livy, who uses this construction

¹ Cf. Neue, Formenlehre,⁴ p. 152, Seyffert, B. ph. Woch. 18, p. 1533, and Sjögren, l. c. p. 62.

² In Val. Max. 4. I ext. 8 *futuri oppositi* (so Kempf), the text is corrupt. Cf. crit. note. Here, however, *oppositi* is to be regarded as adjectival (=adversi), paralleled by a similar use of *obiecti* in the next clause.

5 times (5. 30. 1; 31. 11. 7; 36. 27. 7; 37. 39. 2; 38. 59. 11).¹ Curtius uses it twice (3. 8. 19; 4. 5. 5) and Celsus once (I pr. = p. 6. 34). Compare its use with *foret* p. 276.

D. FUTURE PARTICIPLE WITH FUISSE.²

The expression *-urum fuisse* first came into use in the Classical period, and was not used at all in poetry. Two writers are conspicuous for the frequency with which they make use of this expression, Cicero who uses it 90 times (most often in the Orat. (41), Phil. (23), Epist. (19), least often in Rhet. (7)) out of the total 99 in the Classical period; and Livy, who uses it over half (63 times) out of a total 109 for the Silver Age. Next to these two writers, *sed longo intervallo*, comes Curtius with 11 occurrences, and Quintilian with 6, Caes., Tac., and Gell. each using it 5 times. For its use with *videor* cf. p. 270.

E. THE FUTURE PARTICIPLE WITH FUISSE UT.

This rare form of expression is found only in Caes., B. C. 3. 101. 2 and Cic., Tusc. 3. 69 (Cic., Lig. 34 has *prius futurum fuisse quam ut*, differing from the others).

F. THE FUTURE PARTICIPLE WITH VIDEOR.

This usage is much more common in prose (195) than in poetry (11), being used by only five poets, Lucil. (1), Cat. (1), Ov. (8), Stat. (1), and Mart. (but in prose).³ It is used more frequently by Cicero than by any other writer (94). It is a significant fact that there are only two writers who insert an

¹ Kühner³ II, 1, p. 168, cites 3 passages in Livy and adds "u. ö.", referring to W.-M. 5. 30. 1. But here *foret* is also included, for which Kühner's "u. ö." is appropriate enough.

² Rarer uses: Sall., 1. 82. 3; Caes. 1. 34. 2; 5. 29. 2; 6. 41. 3; 43. 5; B. C. 3. 101. 3; Nepos 9. 1. 3; 2. 3; 17. 6. 1; Sen. rhet. S. 2. 22; C. 10. 5. 27; Vell. 2. 37. 3; Val. Max. 3. 2. ext. 1; 8. 1. absol. 9; 9. 4. 2; Celsus, 9. 8; Sen., Dial. 5. 22. 5; Plin., Nat. 7. 110; 28. 25; Quint. 2. 16. 9; 4. 2. 38; 5. 6. 10; 10. 2. 7; 11. 1. 27; 12. 1. 20; Tac., Ann. 2. 31; 71; 14. 29; 15. 35; Hirt. 1. 50; Plin., Ep. 4. 22. 6; 5. 13. 4; 8. 6. 12; Pan. 7. 1; Suet., Iul. 56. 4; Aug. 31. 3; Otho 10. 1; Just. 29. 3. 2; Gell. 10. 16. 11; 12. 5. 6; 13. 29. 2; 18. 5. 6; 20. 2. 53; Apul., Apol. 66. 10; Curt. 4. 14. 7; 5. 7. 11; 12. 1; 6. 8. 10; 28; 10. 18; 7. 5. 39; 6. 6; 10. 6; 8; 9. 6. 12.

³ Cf. Lucil. 314; Cat. 48. 4; Ovid, Her. 4. 36; 129; A. A. 1. 449; Rem. 416; Met. 4. 343; 526; 606; 8. 348; Stat., Th. 6. 544, and Mart. I pr. (prose).

esse in this expression,¹ Cicero (23) and Quintilian, Decl. (1). With these 24 occurrences contrast the use of the fut. participle without *esse*, 181 times. As Cicero's usage is contrary to that of all the other writers in adding an *esse*, it deserves special attention. The fact that he "omits" an *esse* over three times as often (71) as he inserts it (23), that he frequently uses an adjective in this construction, the *pres. part.* also, as Planc. 55 *retinens videtur*, the *perf.*, as Font. 28 *retenta videatur*, points to some special reason for this exceptional usage. An examination of the passages will show that this exception is to be accounted for by the laws he formulated for the rhythmical clausula of his periods.²

Note also the use of the fut. part. with the infinitival form *videri* in: Caes., B. C. 1. 2. 1. *eum facturum videri*; Ovid, Met. 9. 606 *potui moritura videri*; and in Curt. 5. 13. 11; Sen., Ben. 6. 23. 1; Quint., Decl. 218. 24. It may also be noted that with *videor* Cicero uses both *fore* and *futurum* (in Epist. *fore* about 7 times as often as *futurum*).

With *fuisse*: *-urus fuisse* with *videor* is very rare, being found in only three writers, Cicero using it 3 times (De Or. 2. 230; 3. 180; Lig. 24), Brutus (Ad Brut. 1. 6. 2) and Livy 5 times (26. 23. 2; 44. 4. 4; 34. 4. 14; 38. 50. 1; 39. 40. 4).³

Videor is also occasionally found with the gerundive, as Tac., Hist. 1. 4 *repetundum videtur*; 33 *festinandum videbatur*.

II. THE FUTURE PARTICIPLE WITH EST,⁴ ETC.

This form of expression, the so-called First Periphrastic Conjugation, whatever its ultimate origin, was one of the first

¹ Quint., Dec. 291. 26 *ut videatur esse aliquid—habiturus*. Cf. Frontinus Str. 4. 5. 13 *dicerentur esse facturi*.

² Of the 23, six are of the type *esse videatur* (Fam. 1. 8. 1; Cat. 2. 20; Sest. 10; 106; N. D. 2. 55; 3. 19); 12 are like *esse venturus* in rhythm (De Or. 1. 11; 2. 31; 85; ad Q. Fr. 1. 4. 4; Att. 2. 16. 1; 4. 16. 5; 6. 1. 3; 15. 2. 2; Fam. 16. 12. 4; Fin. 2. 28; 3. 47; Cato M. 71); 3 are like *visurus esse* (double trochee) (Att. 4. 16. 7; 12. 14. 3; Brut. 18). In the two remaining we have a double cretic-trochee combination (Phil. 11. 6) and the heroic clausula (Att. 10. 17. 3).

³ Similar constructions with other verbs may here be noted as Cic., Inv. 2. 74 with *negabitur*; 78 with *arbitrentur*; Att. 17. 14. 2 with *dicebantur* (Cf. Plaut., Truc. 85) and Ovid, Pont. 2. 3. 59 with *putetur*.

⁴ For a careful discussion of the nature and use of such forms cf. Steele, Class. Phil. VII, pp. 457 f.

to find an extended use. Even in early Latin it had already developed five distinct uses, representing an act as intended, on the point of happening, destined to occur, and expressing a resolve, and mere futurity.¹ The table on p. 272 will show at a glance the relative frequency with which each Mood and Tense is used from Plautus to Apuleius, together with the detailed usage of some of the important writers. The Fut. Perf. Indic., being non-existent, is not recorded.

It will be noted that this form of expression is used more often in prose than in poetry, and that, while there is no decided difference between the usage of Classical prose and Silver prose, there is a marked contrast between the usage of Classical poetry and that of Silver poetry. The usage of writers other than those mentioned above is as follows:² Auct. Her. 20 (5. 7); Sall., C., J. 8 (15. 1); Nepos 11 (10. 3); Varro, L. L. 6 (29. 5); Vitruv. 23 (11. 3); Sen. rhet. 106 (4. 9); Vell. 7 (13); Val. Max. 37 (13); Celsus 20 (18. 1); Curt. 41 (6. 7); Mela 1 (79); Petron. 10 (16); Pliny, Nat. 22 (86); Quint. 107 (5. 2); Quint., Decl. 115 (3. 8); Frontinus 10 (14. 3); Suet., Vit. Caes. 5 (50. 8); Florus 3 (35); Just. 19 (13. 8); Gellius 18 (28. 8); in poetry: Lucr. 2 (99); Catull. 1 (73); Tib. 1 (35); Prop. 14 (8. 4); Phaedr. 2 (25); Lucan 8 (40. 7); Val. Flacc. 1 (197); Stat. 1 (707); Mart. 9 (38. 2); Juv. 2 (52. 5); and not at all in Persius (19 pp.) and Sil. It. (425 pp.).

With regard to the use of this periphrastic conjugation it may be said that it possessed one characteristic which commended itself to the popular mind. The fact that it eliminated all difficulties in deciding whether to use *-bo*, *-bis*, *-bit* or *-am*, *-es*, *-et* (for the confusion caused thereby cf. Neue, pp. 322 f.) played no small part in the extended use of it in the colloquial language. It is significant too that Cicero in his Letters used it at the rate of 1 in 3. 5 pages, but in his Rhet., 1 in 9. 3 pp., in his Orat. 1 in 7. 4 and Phil. 1 in 6. 5; that writers like Plaut. and Ter. use it at the rate of 1 in 9 pp., Ovid 1 in 9. 3, but Vergil

¹ Cf. Bennett, Synt. of Early Latin, I pp. 457 f. For Plautus' usage we have the statistics of Postgate (I. F. IV. p. 257) and Sjögren, *l. c.* p. 196 (those of the latter, as an independent investigation showed, being more accurate), and for Terence, Sjögren, *ibid.*

² The rate, one ex. in so many Teubner pages, is given in parenthesis.

	Indicative.						Subjunctive.						Relative Frequency.	
	Impf.			Perf.			Impf.			Perf.			No. of pages.	in pages.
	Pres.	Fut.	Ind.	Plupf.	Subj.	Totl.	Pres.	Impf.	Plupf.	Subj.	Totl.	No. of pages.		
Plautus	117	1	0	2	0	120	16	1	0	18	138	1,243	9.0	
Terence	27	0	0	1	2	30	5	1	0	6	36	336	9.3	
Cato agr.	0	0	11	0	0	11	1	0	0	1	12	86	7.2	
Early Latin	144	1	11	3	2	161	22	2	0	25	186	1,665	8.9	
Class. Prose.	200	62	13	18	1	294	396	155	7	575	869	5,700	6.6	
Class. Poetry.	47	47	4	13	5	111	17	2	1	21	132	2,017	15.3	
Class. Period.	247	109	17	31	6	405	413	157	8	596	1001	7,717	7.7	
Silver Prose.	442	154	22	47	11	676	228	257	13	583	1259	11,192	8.9	
Silver Poetry.	10	3	2	3	1	19	4	4	0	9	28	2,602	92.9	
Silver Period.	452	157	24	50	12	695	232	261	13	592	1287	13,794	10.7	
Cicero	171	53	7	18	1	250	375	134	5	531	781	4,460	5.7	
Caesar	1	2	0	0	0	3	5	4	0	10	13	340	26.1	
Vergil	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	3	356	118.7	
Horace	4	2	0	0	0	6	3	1	0	4	10	262	26.2	
Ovid	34	39	3	13	4	93	5	1	1	8	101	953	9.3	
Livy	67	66	0	8	4	145	52	127	6	219	364	1,946	5.3	
Sen. phil.	162	15	16	7	0	200	65	17	1	87	287	1,496	5.2	
Tacitus	10	4	0	0	0	14	3	7	0	16	30	600	20.0	
Pliny ep.	16	4	2	1	1	24	8	12	0	20	44	380	8.6	
Suet.	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	4	5	254	50.8	
Apuleius	7	2	0	0	0	9	2	2	0	4	13	642	49.3	

1 in 118. 7, Lucr. 1 in 99, and that of the 10 examples in Horace, 8 are in the Satires and Epodes (metrical considerations could not, it is maintained, account entirely for the difference in use). Such facts point to a colloquial origin and the conclusion that in the Classical period such forms were not regarded as appropriate for use in the higher forms of literature.

The fact, too, that in such an impersonal and technical work as that of Pliny the Elder it is used at the rate of 1 in 86 pp., but in the more lively narrative of Pliny the Younger it is used at the rate of 1 in 8.6 pp., not to mention other contrasts, shows that the character of the subject-matter must also be taken into consideration.

The table also shows that there was a growth in the use of the subjunctive; e. g., in Plaut. the indicative was used much oftener (120) than the subj. (18), but in Cicero the subj. (531) is used over twice as often as the indic. (250), in Caesar over three times as often. On the contrary, it is to be noted that in poetry from Plautus to Juvenal the indic. is almost invariably used oftener than the subj.; e. g., in Ovid 93-8, Prop. 8-5, Lucan 6-2, Mart. 6-3. Finally, the subj. was used oftener in Classical prose (1 in 9. 9 pp.) than in Silver prose (1 in 19. 2 pp.); with a still stronger contrast between Classical poetry (1 in 96) and Silver poetry (1 in 289. 1).

POSITION OF THE NEGATIVE.

The position of the negative *non* is worthy of note. It may be said that in general such forms as *venturus est* were not considered as a unit. One point of evidence supporting this view is the fact that the two words are frequently separated, as, e. g., in Cic., Flacc. 3, where 16 words intervene, and in Balb. 52 were 7 words separate the two parts. Throughout the literature to Apuleius *non* shows a decided tendency to attach itself to the verb, the most common forms being *non est venturus* and *venturus non est* [similarly with *esse* (exc. Plaut., Cist. 236, M. G. 1411; Gell. 12. 11. 2) and *fuisse* (exc. Cic., Cael. 56)]. The only exceptions noted were Plaut., Bacch. 1004 *non laturus sum*; Capt. 14; but none in the Classical period, and but two in the Silver Age, Sen., Contr. exc. 8. 4 *non ausurus fuit* and Sen., Ben. 5. 21. 3 *non ablaturus ero, sed recepturus*; i. e., the exceptions are all in Plaut. and Silver Latin.

NOTEWORTHY TENSE FORMS.

I. INDICATIVE.

a) *Present*: This form is in general the one in most frequent use, in fact the only one used in the indicative by Varro, L. L., Bell. Afr., Mela, Lucr., Verg., Sen. trag., and Just.

b) *Imperfect and Perfect*: the former is generally used rather than the latter,¹ except in 8 writers, 4 being poets, 4 belonging to the Silver Age: Plaut. (1-2), Ter. (0-1), Petron. (0-1), Quint. (4-4), Celsus (0-1), Florus (0-2), Lucan (1-1), and Mart. (0-2). Note, however, Sen. rhet. (12-5), Val. Max. (10-1), Curt. (10-1), and see the table, p. 272.

The *Perfect* was late in being developed. Before the Classical period it was found only 3 times, twice in Plaut. (Asin. 621, Most. 437), and once in Ter. (Haut. 817), and in the Classical period there are only two writers that use it, Cicero (18: Rhet. 1, Orat. 10, Epist. 4, Phil. 3) and Ovid² (13). In the Silver Age it was used by 13 prose writers and by 2 poets, Lucan and Martial. The Perf. was used most often by Quint., Decl. 14 (1 in 31. 5 pp.), Ovid 13 (1 in 73. 3); Cicero 18 (1 in 247. 8).

¹ Blase, H. G. III, p. 275, says: "Umgekehrt ist bei den beiden Seneca *fui* vielleicht häufiger als *eram*". Note, however, that in both Senecas the form with *eram* is used over twice as often as that in *fui*: Sen. rhet., 12 to 5, Sen. phil. 15 to 7 (to the 2 cited for impf. add: Suas. 2. 3; 6. 22; Contr. pr. 17; 1. 1. 11 bis; 2. 20; 22; exc. 2. 5; exc. 6. 6; Lemma 9. 2. 24; and to the 3 for *fui* add: exc. 8. 4; 10 pr. 6; to 0 cited for *eram* in Sen. phil. add: Dial. 10. 17. 2; Ben. 3. 7. 6 bis; 11. 1; 5. 6. 2 bis; 6. 8. 3; Clem. 1. 9. 11; 15. 3; 18. 2; N. Q. 4 b, 5. 4; Epist. 79. 4; 91. 2; 110. 10; 121. 4; to the 2 cited for *fui* add: Dial. 6. 21. 4; Ben. 4. 35. 2; 6. 14. 4; Ep. 68. 12. For the perfect "im Hauptsatz" in Cic. add: Cat. 4. 17; Lig. 23 bis; 24; Fato 19 and to the 3 "im Nebensatz" add: Att. 14. 14. 2; Q. Fr. 1. 1. 23; Phil. 2. 88; Tusc. 1. 48; Div. 2. 20; Or. 1. 110 (i. e. in Cic. there are 9 in princ., 9 in subord. clauses).

² To the 8 cited by Blase, l. c. for the *perf.* in Ovid add: Am. 2. 14. 10; 18; Her. 2. 110; Trist. 4. 10. 79; Fast. 4. 613; to the 2 cited for Quint. add: 4. 1. 67; 5. 10. 47. To the 4 for the *perf.* cited for Livy add: 2. 1. 4; 38. 47. 4; 40. 10. 2; 14. 11; and to the 1 in Quint. add: 4. 15. 7; 7. 4. 2; 10. 1. 115; and to the 1 for Florus add: 1. 3. 11. The following uses of the *perf.* were not noted: Val. Max. 4. 7. 1; Curt. 7. 1. 39; Petron. 94; Quint., Decl. 37. 1; 54. 11; 119. 31; 132. 2; 146. 19; 297. 8; 302. 18; 310. 8; 341. 19; 367. 25 f. (5 times); Plin., Ep. 7. 27. 14; Celsus, 336. 30; Just. 1. 7. 10; Gell. 2. 22. 25 and Lucan 8. 97; Mart. 5. 34. 5; 10. 41. 5. For the use of the *perf.* etc. in conditional sentences cf. Thielmann, Archiv, II, pp. 188 f.

c) *Future*: to express futurity the form with the fut. part. and *est* seems to have satisfied all ordinary requirements, the double expression of futurity in the fut. part. and *erit*, which filled out the complete formal scheme, being reserved for a more energetic situation (compare the double comparative, etc.). A glance at the Table shows that forms like *facturus est* were used 843 times, while those like *facturus erit* were used only 52 times (11 being in Cato). The latter form was used by three writers before Cato,¹ by Cato (11), Auct. Her. (2), Cic. (7), Vitruv. (4), Celsus (1), Sen. phil. (16), Pliny, Nat. (1), Quint. (2), Pliny, Ep. (2), and in poetry by Prop. (1), Ovid (3), and Mart. (2), most often relatively to the size by Cato (1 in 1. 8 pp.), and Sen. phil. (1 in 93. 5) (by Cic. only 1 in 637 pp.). Two instances are found in Livy (38. 38. 2; 8), but in these Livy is recording the terms of a treaty.

d) *Pluperfect*:² this form, next to the future, is the rarest of all (only 20 times in these 23,176 pp.). It was first used by Ter. (2), then not till Cic. (1), Tib. (1), and Ovid (4), Sen. rhet. (1), Livy (4), Quint., Decl. (2), Frontin. (1), Pliny, Ep. (1), Just. (2), and Mart. (1).

II. SUBJUNCTIVE: This mood is rarely used in principal clauses. Blase l. c. p. 275 says: "Nur ein solcher Konjunktiv im Hauptsatz ist mir bekannt, nämlich Val. Flacc. 7. 534." Three others are to be added: Ovid, Am. 2. 15. 21; Prop. 3. 19. 6, and Quint., Dec. 361. 11.

a) PRESENT AND IMPERFECT: the pres. was the first form to find extended use. In early Latin 22 out of 25 are in this tense, and later this was the only tense used by Lucr. (1), Catull. (1), Verg. (1), Prop. (5), Celsus (4), Val. Fl. (1), and Juv.

¹ Cf. Neue III^a, p. 162. To the 8 passages cited for Cato add: 30; 100; 142. 3; to the 13 in Sen. phil. add: Dial. 7. 24. 1; Ben. 2. 10. 1; Ep. 99. 23 (76. 21 is cited for 76. 27); and to Blase p. 273 add: Auct. Her. 3. 8; to the 3 in Cic. add: De Or. 2. 99; Att. 12. 34. 3; Fato 27; De Leg. 1. 43 (i. e. in Cic., Rhet. = 4; Epist. = 1; Orat. = 0; Phil. = 2); read Prop. 4. 11. 79; and add Vitruv. 4. 6. 3; 5. 6. 6; 12. 5; 6. 8. 7, all being with *futurus*. Add also to Neue: Ovid, A. A. 2. 287; 350; Celsus, 58. 17; Plin., Nat. 18. 193; Quint. 4. 3. 10; Plin., Ep. 4. 13. 8; Mart. 11. 5. 10; 14. 181.

² Cf. Blase III, p. 222, but note that Ovid, Met. 14. 72 is bracketed, Pont. 2. 11. 19 omitted, as also Sen., Contr. 10. 4. 3; Val. Max. 4. 2. 7; Quint., Decl. 146. 14; 301. 24; Frontinus, 4. 1. 33; and Mart. 11. 91. 9.

(1). Next came the *imperf.* and these two tenses are the only ones used by Ter. (5-1), Auct. Her. (6-2), Sall. (3-2), Nepos (1-7), Pliny, Ep. (8-12), Apul. (2-2), Hor. (3-1), Lucan (1-1). Only the *imperf.* is used by Hirt. (2), Vell. (6), Sen. trag. (2), Frontinus (6). Note that in contrast to Cicero's usage of the pres. 375 times to the *imperf.* 134, Livy used the *imperf.* 127 times to the pres. 52, and that in harmony with Livy's usage stands Nepos 7-1, Vell. 6-0, Val. Max. 14-3, Curt. 13-6, Front. 6-0, Tac. 7-3, Pliny, Ep. 12-8; but in harmony with Cicero's usage Hor. 3-1, Prop. 5-0, Ovid 5-1, Sen. phil. 65-17, Quint. 43-7, and Quint., Decl. 18-6.

*Future Participle with foret.*¹ This form of expression was first used in prose by Sall. (1), Nepos (2), in poetry by Prop. (2. 29. 28), and Ovid (Her. 4. 125). Livy, whose style in a number of details shows an affinity to that of Sallust and Nepos (cf. Lease, Livy (1914), Intr. §§ 27 and 28)² is conspicuous for the frequency with which he used this form³ (2-8-3-1). It is also found in Vell. (2. 37. 3; 55. 3; 90. 3), Val. M. (7. 3. 5), Sen. phil. (1), Curt. (8. 13. 18), Front. (Str. 7. 3. 5), Tac. (Ann. 2. 30; Hist. 4. 86); Gell. (12. 11. 2; 14. 1; 20; Tiro 10. 1. 7), Apul. (1). This form of expression did not find favor with the poets, only three using it, Prop., Ovid, and Lucan (7. 464) and that but once each. For the *gerundive* with *foret*, found in Hor., frequently in Livy, cf. Kühner,² II, 1, p. 168. Compare also its use with *fore*, which appears first in Livy (Schmalz, Synt. 4, p. 463).

b) PERFECT:⁴ this form was used as early as Plautus (Pers. 296), but was not used again in poetry, except once, Ovid, Am. 2. 14. 21 (Martial used it, Bk. II, praef., in prose). In the

¹ Cf. Blase, p. 277, and add the passages cited above in parenthesis.

² So also in the use of the perf. part. with *foret*. Add to Neue pp. 153 f. Sall., Cat. 14. 7; 18. 8; 39. 4; Iug. 21. 2; 27. 2; 30. 1; Nepos, 6. 3. 5; 7. 8. 4; 15. 7. 5; 23. 7. 3.

³ Cf. Neue III, p. 174, who omits 28. 22. 10; 44. 26. 9 and Riemann Et.³ p. 231 who omits the latter.

⁴ Blase, p. 278, simply cites the one passage in Plaut., those in Cic., and refers to Neue, III, pp. 164 f. Here Neue cites 3 for Livy, instead of 34 (12-10-8-4), 3 for Sen. phil., omitting Ep. 32. 3; Ben. 3. 8. 4 (Ep. 9. 14 is cited for 9. 17, but here Hense reads *foret*), and 1 for Tac. instead of 6 (cf. G. & Gr. Lex.).

Classical Period Cicero was the only prose writer to use it (17), Ovid the only poet (1). In the Silver Age it was used relatively most frequently by Quint., Decl. 23 (1 in 19. 2 pp.), Livy made a wider use of it (1 in 57. 2) than Cicero (1 in 262. 3). It was also used¹ by Sen. rhet. (2), Val. M. (3), Sen. phil. (4), Curt. (3), Petron. (1), Pliny, Nat. (1), Quint. (5), Tac. (6), Suet. (1), Flor. (1), Just. (1).

c) PLUPERFECT:² This form does not appear until the Classical period and was never common, being found but 8 times in 7717 pages in that period, 13 times in the Silver Age in 13,794 pages. It begins with Cicero (5), Caes. (1), after whom it is used by Vitruv. (1), Ovid (1), Sen. rhet. (2), Livy (6), Vell. (1), Sen. phil. (1), Curt. (1), Quint. (1), Q. Decl. (1). It will be observed that this form is found only once in poetry (Ovid) (in part due to metrical considerations).

III. THE FUTURE PARTICIPLE.³

For the sake of brevity and clearness the tabular form of presentation is here adopted. The most important writers in each period and department of literature are here selected for detailed usage. For the present purpose the varied uses of the fut. participle have not been differentiated, but simply classified under the general headings of Adjectival and Substantival. *Futurus* has been treated separately, its purely participial and

¹ Perf. is also used in: Sen., Suas. 2. 7. 10; Contro. 9. 1. 1; Val. Max. 2. 8. 2; 5. 3 ext. 3; 8. 2. 2; Curt. 7. 4. 4; 5. 26; 10. 2. 25; Petron. 101; Pliny, Nat. 17. 155; Quint. 3. 6. 103; 5. 12. 13; 7. 2. 37; 4. 12; 9. 2. 41; Suet., Claud. 38. 3; Florus, 2. 6. 19; Just. 22. 7. 7.

² Blase, p. 228, simply refers to Neue, III¹ pp. 165 and 187 (the latter treats the forms *-ndus*). For the citations omitted by Neue cf.: Cic., Fam. 13. 10. 3; (Lig. 23 now has: *fuistis*); Caes., B. G. 1. 40. 13; Vitruv. 10. 22. 9; Ovid, Her. 17. 91; Sen. Contr. 1. 2. 19; exc. 1. 2; Livy, 10. 28. 1; 45. 3; 23. 39. 2; 36. 5. 6; 38. 46. 6; Vell. 2. 125. 1; Sen., Ben. 5. 20. 6; Curt. 6. 8. 10; Quint. 9. 2. 80; and Quint., Decl. 73. 9.

³ Of special value for a study of its varied uses in Cicero are the monographs of F. Hoppe, Gumbinnen, 1875 and 1879; in the Augustan poets, Sommer, Halle, 1881; and for its use to express purpose, R. B. Steele, A. J. P. XIX (1898), pp. 275 ff.; for the literature in general, cf. Nägelsbach Stil.⁹ p. 487.

purely adjectival functions being presented under the category Adjectival.

Principal writers.	Future Participle.					Futurus.				
	Pages.	Adj.	i in pages.	Subst.	i in pages.	Adj.	i in pages.	Subst.	i in pages.	
Sall. C. and J.	121	2	60.5	1	121	1	121	0	0	
Cicero	4,460	4	1115	1	4460	68	65.6	72	61.9	
Caesar	340	0	0	0	0	1	340	0	0	
Nepos	113	0	0	0	0	1	113	0	0	
Vitruvius	261	0	0	0	0	3	87	2	130.5	
Class. Prose.....	5,700	8	712.5	2	2850	74	77	74	77	
Lucr.	198	0	0	0	0	4	49.5	0	0	
Vergil	356	51	6.9	5	71.2	16	22.3	4	89	
Horace	262	38	6.9	0	0	3	87.3	4	65.5	
Propert.	118	23	5.1	0	0	3	39.3	0	0	
Ovid	957	198	4.8	12	79.4	18	52.9	19	50.2	
Class. Poetry.....	2,017	323	6.2	20	100.9	45	44.8	29	69.5	
Livy	1,946	129	15.1	2	873	47	41.4	15	129.7	
Sen. rhet.	526	43	12.2	8	65.8	13	40.5	11	52.6	
Sen. phil.	1,496	283	5.3	44	34	34	44	44	34	
Curtius	276	103	2.7	3	92	9	30.7	4	69	
Pliny nat.	1,892	51	37.1	8	236.5	12	157.8	9	210.2	
Quint.	564	37	15.2	21	26.9	20	28.2	7	80.6	
Plin. ep.	380	56	6.8	10	38	7	54.3	9	42.2	
Tacitus	600	113	5.3	7	85.7	15	40	21	28.6	
Apuleius	642	36	17.8	3	214	18	35.7	7	91.7	
Silver Prose.....	11,192	1,121	9.9	118	94.8	229	48.9	141	78.8	
Sen. trag.	430	22	19.5	5	86	8	53.8	3	143.3	
Lucan	326	94	3.5	3	108.7	6	54.3	14	23.3	
Val. Flacc.	197	12	16.4	4	49.2	2	98.5	6	35.7	
Martial	343	25	13.7	1	343	3	114.3	0	0	
Juvenal	105	20	5.3	2	52.5	2	52.5	1	105	
Silver Poetry.....	2,602	303	8.6	21	130.1	44	59.1	38	70.3	

A. ADJECTIVAL.

The stylistic possibilities of the future participle were not developed until the Augustan Age. See p. 263. In the *Classical period* it was used by Sall.¹ (2), Cicero (4), Bell. Afr. (2), and

¹ Cf. Sall., B. J. 35. 10; 106. 3 (also Ep. Mith. 18; Hist. 1. 32; 2. 1; cf. Quint. 9. 3. 12); Cic., Verr. 1. 56; Tusc. 4. 14; N. D. 1. 29; Att. 8. 9. 2 (in Ad. Q. Fr. 2. 5. 2 the text is uncertain). Cic. uses only *laturus*, *venturus*, *eventurus*, and *acturus*.

most freely in poetry Verg. (51), Hor. (38), Tib. (11), Lygd. etc. (2), Prop. (23), and Ovid (198). Owing to the influence of poetry and Livy this usage was greatly extended in the *Silver Age*:¹ Livy² (129), Sen. rhet. (43), Vell. (14), Val. Max. (48), Celsus (5), Sen. phil. (283), Curt. (103), Mela (6), Petron. (10), Plin., Nat. (51), Quint.³ (37), Q. Decl. (24), Frontinus (43), Tac. (113), Pliny, Ep. (56), Suet. (44), Florus (9), Just. (6), Gell. (5), Apul. (36), and in poetry, Phaedr. (3), Sen. trag. (22), Lucan (94), Persius (3), Val. Fl. (12), Sil. It. (25), Stat. (99), Mart. (25), and Juv. (20). This usage is found most frequently in Curtius (1 in 2. 7 pp.), Frontinus (3. 3 p.), Just. (4. 5), Sen. phil. and Tac. (5. 3), all historians, and least frequently in Gell. (103. 8), Celsus (72. 4) and Pliny, Nat. (37. 1), which is not surprising considering the technical and impersonal character of the subject-matter.

a) PARTICLES WITH THE FUTURE PARTICIPLE.⁴ The force of the fut. part. is further clarified and accentuated by the use of particles, as by *tamquam*, beginning with Ovid and Livy, by *quasi*, beginning with Ovid and Sen. rhet., by *ut* beginning with Hor., Prop., and Livy, and by *velut* beginning with Livy.

Tamquam, 55 times in prose, but only twice in poetry:⁵ found most frequently in Sen. phil. (17), the nearest being Livy (8), Frontin. (8), and more rarely Val. Max. (4), Quint.,

¹F. Helm's monograph, *De part. usu Tac., Vell., Sall.* (1879) has been of service in checking up the citations made by the author for these writers.

²Vielhaber, *Liv. Stud.* (Wien) 1871 is far more accurate and complete than Wenger, *Gebr. d. Part. bei Liv.* (Linz), 1882 and Gütthling *De T. Liv. Or. Cap. II.* 1872.

³Quintilian's remark (9. 3. 12) is interesting in view of his own practice.

⁴Cf. in general Schmalz, *Synt.*⁴ p. 458 and Kühner², II, 1, pp. 790 f., whose citations, however, are far from complete.

⁵*Tamquam*: Livy, 21. 61. 1; 30. 10. 10; 34. 36. 5; 36. 41. 1; 43. 10; 37. 23. 6; 40. 4. 10; 44. 9. 10; Vell. 2. 109. 1; Val. Max. 2. 6. 11; 3. 2 ext. 3; 9. 6. 2; 9. 12 ext. 10; Sen. phil., N. Q. 30. 2; Dial. 5. 3. 6; 17. 7; 7. 23. 4; 10. 3. 4; Ben. 4. 16. 2; 5. 20. 6; 7; Ep. 21. 1; 32. 1; 46. 1; 59. 14; 70. 17; 82. 21; 98. 5; 5; 123. 10 (over half in his Epist.); Petron. 99; Quint. 6. 1. 39; 9. 2. 82; Quint., Decl. 164. 17; 201. 1; 227. 4; 281. 30; Frontin. 1, [1. 1]; 5. 3; 10; 13; 2. 5. 30; 38; 3. 6. 1; 1; Tac., Ann. 6. 36. 3; 12. 49. 5; 50. 10; 14. 10. 4; 33. 17; Hist. 4. 19. 15; Dial. 2. 16; Pliny, Ep. 2. 20. 11; 6. 33. 2; Gell. 1. 3. 30 bis; and Ovid, Met. 10. 269; Juv. 4. 148.

Decl. (4), Quint. (2), Pliny, Ep. (2), Gell. (2), and once each, Vell., Petron., and the two poets Ovid and Juvenal.

Quasi, found 44¹ times (2 in poetry): most frequently in Suet. (16), then Just. (6), and Sen. phil. (5), then Tac. (3), Pliny, Ep. (3), twice each by Sen. rhet., Curt., Front., once each by Val. Max., Florus, Gellius, but in poetry only Ovid, Met. 9. 228; Phaedr. 3. 2. 8 (note that Cicero, Tusc. 5. 81 has *quasi certo futurum* (a subst.)).

Ut, 26 times² (3 in poetry): most often in Livy (7), and Tac. (6), then Just. (4), Pliny, Ep. (3), Sen. rhet. (2), and once each by Val. Max., Sen. phil.; in poetry: Hor., Prop., Lucan.

Velut, 20 times³ (poetry 1): Just. (5), Livy (4), Val. Max. (3), Curt. (2), and once each in Sen. rhet., Sen. phil., Pliny Nat., Quint., Tac.; in poetry, only Lucan, 7. 33.

The following may also be noted: *ceu*: Stat., Th. 9. 67; 11. 362; 561; *dumtaxat* Val. Max. 5. 7. 1; *fortassis* Pliny, Nat. 25. 22 (abl. abs.): *nempe* Sen., N. Q. 6. 32. 10; *nisi* Ovid, Trist. 4. 1. 72; Sen., Dial. 5. 19. 3; Ben. 4. 11. 6; Ep. 29. 1; 97. 6; Pliny, Nat. 11. 54; *perinde ac* Val. M. 8. 11 ext. 2; *prius quam* Livy 7. 31. 2 (cf. 8. 14. 6 with perf.); *proinde* Suet., Iul. 22. 2; *quamlibet* Ovid, Her. 3. 20; *quamvis*⁴ Prop. 1. 15. 13 (in 1. 8. 33 sc. esset); *utique* Livy 5. 39. 12; 25. 6. 9; 35. 30. 7.

¹ *Quasi*: Suet., Iul. 81. 4; 82. 1; Tib. 39; 70. 3; 73. 2; Cal. 34. 2; 46; Nero, 40. 3; 47. 3; 57. 1; Galba, 9; 10. 1; Otho, 6. 2; 7. 1; Vit. 15. 4; 17. 1; Just. 16. 4. 20; 22. 2. 10; 26. 1. 7; 7; 27. 3. 1; 29. 2. 8; Sen., N. Q. 3, pr. 4; Dial. 6. 9. 4; 22. 6; Ben. 5. 16. 4; Ep. 22. 14; Tac., Ann. 2. 63; 5. 10; 72; Plin., Ep. 6. 16. 2; Pan. 2. 8; 73. 6; Sen., Cont. 1. 2. 1; 9. 6. 3; Curt. 10. 5. 15; 4. 3. 22 (abl. abs.); Front. 1. 4. 13a; 8. 12; Val. Max. 2. 6. 11; Flor. 3. 20. 9; Gell. 10. 14. 6.

² *Ut*: Livy, 3. 5. 1; 7. 23. 6; 21. 32. 10; 28. 26. 12; 31. 42. 5; 35. 50. 11; 42. 63. 5; Tac., Ann. 1. 47; Hist. 1. 75; 2. 48; 58; 80; 3. 68; Just. 1. 3. 4; 7. 3. 5; 29. 2. 8; Pliny, Ep. 6. 5. 7; 7. 26. 2; Pan. 48. 1; Sen., Suas. 6. 17; Cont. 2. 2. 10; Val. Max. 5. 9. 2; Sen., Dial. 9. 11. 1; Cont. 2. 2. 10; Val. Max. 5. 9. 2; Sen., Dial. 9. 11. 1; and Hor., Sat. 2. 8. 85; Prop. 4. 11. 84; Lucan, 3. 99.

³ *Velut*: Just. 5. 10. 9; 12. 13. 3; 18. 6. 6; 22. 2. 10; 33. 2. 2; Livy, 30. 4. 10; 40. 56. 2; 44. 35. 14; 23; Val. Max. 4. 6, ext. 3; 7. 3. 3; 8. 11, ext. 1; Curt. 7. 4. 5; 9. 7. 19; Sen., cont. 10, pr. 1; Sen., Dial. 12. 10. 9; Plin., Nat. praef. 26; Quint., 8. pr. 18; Tac., Ann. 4. 69.

⁴ Kühner³ II, 2, p. 445, says: "*quamvis* c. part. nicht im klass. Spr."

b) FUTURE PARTICIPLE IN ABL. ABS. This construction first appears in literature in Asinius Pollio (Landgraf, Archiv VI, p. 51; cf. XIII, p. 275). It is also found in Prop. 4. 11. 70; Ovid, Her. 18. 111; Met. 8. 409; 6 times in Livy¹ (with *tamquam* 30. 10. 10; 36. 41. 1); Val. Max. 9. 3 ext. 3 (cf. the pres. in 7. 8. 8); Celsus 83. 23; Curt. 4. 3. 22 (*quasi*); 5. 10. 7; 8. 6. 15; Pliny, Nat. 18. 341; 19. 189; 25. 22; 11. 54 (*nisi*); Quint. 6 pr. 3; 12. 10. 73; Front. [1. 11. 15]; 3. 17. 8; Mart. 8. 21. 2; 32. 8. To the 5 cited by Draeger (Synt. Tac.) add: Ann. 12. 25. 8; Hist. 2. 16. 4; 4. 39. 15; and note Ann. 15. 52 *daturis qui*.

c) PECULIAR USAGES. As imitations of the Greek idiom are to be regarded: Plaut., Asin. 364 *daturus dixit*; Prop. 2. 9. 7 *visura speraret* (cf. the perf.: Verg., A. 2. 377 *sensit delapsus*); Stat., Th. 1. 347 *ventura minantur*; 7. 792 *scit peritura* (Prisc., G. L. III, 314, 14 says: *pro scit se perituram*), and Apul., Met. 7. 14 *promitterent habituri*.

d) THE FUTURE PARTICIPLE AS AN APODOSIS.² This usage begins with the Augustan poets Hor. (3), Prop. (1), Ovid (6) and with Livy (15). With ellipsis of the verb it is already found in Sall., Ep. Mith. 12; also in Hor., A. P. 476; Ovid, Met. 6. 207; and Sen., Clem. 1. 4. 1. It is found most often relatively in Curt. 12 (1 in 23 pp.), Tac. 12 (1 in 75), Sen. phil. 15 (1 in 128. 3), Livy 15 (in 129. 7), and Ovid 6 (1 in 158. 3). With this usage is to be compared the frequent use of the fut. part. with *esse* and *est* in apodosis.

B. SUBSTANTIVAL.

The use of the future participle as a substantive first appears in the classical period. A beginning was first made with *futuros* (Sall., Or. Lep. 6) from which this process gradually spread to other participles. In the Classical period *futurus*

¹ Cf. Draeger II², p. 790 and note that in 44. 11. 9 the text has been changed and in 45. 35. 6 the dative is more likely. Cf. also Steele, A. J. P. XXIII (1902), pp. 298 f.

² For its use in general cf. Draeger, II², p. 754, and Kühner³ II, 1. 761. Both, however, omit Hor., C. 4. 3. 20; Sat. 1. 6. 130; 10. 89; Prop. 1. 15. 27; Ovid, Met. 5. 270; 9. 562; Trist. 3. 14. 40; Pont. 2. 5. 35; 11. 21; 3. 2. 108. Kühner³ cites only 5 occurrences in Livy; there are 15 (5-5-4-1).

constitutes 74 out of 76 participial substantives and it was not until Sen. phil. that the use of other fut. ptes. has come up to the use of *futurus* (each 44), but by the time of Quintilian other participles are used almost three times (20) as often as *futurus* (8). In poetry *futurus* is generally in the majority, as in Ovid (19-12), Lucan (14-3), Statius (10-4), but in Horace only *futurus* is used, and in Vergil it is used one time less (4-5).

In the *Classical period* this usage (excluding *futurus*) is very rare in prose, being used but twice (Sall., Jug. 1. 5 *profutura*; Cic., De Div. 1. 29 *eventura*), but in poetry¹ ten times as often (Ovid 12, Verg. 5, Tib. 2, Lygd. 1; in the last three, *eventura*, as also Ovid, Pont. 3. 413).

In the *Silver Age*² this usage was widely extended: the rate in the Classical period is 1 in 350. 8 pp., but in the Silver Age 1 in 99. 2 pp. As indicative of the extent to which this usage was developed may be cited such passages as Quint. 11. 3. 157 (cited by Schmalz, Stil.⁴ p. 611), and Sen., Dial. 1. 5. 7 *accepimus peritura perituri*; Tac. Ann. 6. 22 *quin ventura destinantur*; Agr. 18 *tarda bellum inchoaturo*. The substantival use of the participle is found most often in Quint. 21 (1 in 26. 9 pp.), Sen. phil. 44 (1 in 34), Pliny, Ep. 10 (1 in 38), and not at all in three prose writers, Florus, Iustinus and Gellius, and five poets, Lucr., Catull., Hor., Prop., and Sil.; once by Val. Max. (465 pp.), Celsus (362), Mela (79), Frontinus (143), and Phaedrus (50), Persius (19), Martial (343). Besides the writers mentioned in the Table it is also used by Vell. 2 (1 in 47 pp.), Curt. 3 (1 in 98), Petron. 2 (1 in 80), Quint., Decl. 2 (1 in 220. 5), Suet. 2 (1 in 127), and Stat. 4 (1 in 176. 8), Juv. 2 (1 in 52. 5).

The future participle, as frequently the perfect, bears the main idea, in combination with a substantive having the force of an abstract noun, the subst. having the force of a genitive. This usage appears first in Livy³ in prose, in poetry in Vergil,

¹ Cf. Sommer, 1. c.

² Cf. Livy 6. 12. 8; 23. 44. 2 (possibly); Val. Max. 2. 6. 9; Celsus 58. 17; Sen. phil. 44 (N. Q. 3, Dial. 13, Ben. 10, Ep. 18); Pliny, Nat. 18. 26 (cf. Schmalz *ib.*); 19. 87; 20. 45; 125; 136; 193; 25. 56; 37. 169; Petron. 1; 112; Suet., Iul. 23. 2; 52. 1; Apul., Met. 54. 12; 175. 18; 221. 26.

³ Cf. Kühner², II. 1, pp. 762, 769, and Naegelsbach, Stil.³ p. 150, Anm.

as Geo. 2. 498; 3. 262; 4. 156; Aen. 2. 660; 10. 99; Ovid, Her. 13. 90; 19. 107; Pont. 3. 2. 11; A. A. 3. 59; Met. 13. 162.

a) GENITIVE PLURAL. The ambiguous form in *-orum* is very rare, being found only in Sen., Dial. 9. 14. 7 *periturorum*, Ep. 77. 13 *moriturorum*, and Pliny, Nat. 25. 56 *moriturorum* (M.). Cf. *futurorum* pp. 284 f.

b) WITH PREPOSITIONS. This usage is also very rare, and found only in Sen., N. Q. 2. 59. 7 *inter perituros*; Ep. 91. 13 *inter peritura*; Iust. 11. 15. 6 *apud intellecturum*.

C. FUTURUS.

Futurus was neither used as an adjective nor as a substantive by Auctor ad Her., Hirt., Varro, L. L. (exc. as a *term. tech.*), B. Afr. and Hisp., Mela, Petron., Frontinus, and Florus, and by four poets, Catullus, Tib., Phaedr. and Persius. It was used as an adjective, but not as a substantive, by Sall., Nepos, Vell., Val. Max., Lucr., Prop. and Mart.

a) *Adjectival*.¹ The Adjectival use begins with Lucr. (4) and Sall. (1), and when used in hexameter verse is always placed in the 6th ft., except Ovid, Fast. 4. 572, and Val. Flacc. 6. 313. This use is found most often in Classical poetry, and Silver prose, least often in Classical prose.² Cicero uses it most often, naturally, in his philosophical works (52), 9 in Epist., 4 in Rhet., and 3 in Orat. In the Silver Age³ this usage is

¹ The purely adjectival and the purely participial use of *futurus*, the former being by far the more common, are here grouped together.

² Cf. Sall., Iug. 27. 3; Cic., Inv. 2. 160; De Or. 2. 206; P. O. 13; 111; De Domo 12; Phil. 2. 89; 10. 17; Fam. 4. 3. 1; 6. 4. 1; 10. 10. 1; Att. 4. 8a, 2; 5. 13. 3; 7. 13a, 3; 14. 11. 1; Ad Brut. 1. 16. 11; and 52 in Phil.; Caes., B. C. 1. 52. 1; Nepos 2. 1. 4; Vitruv. 1. 2. 2; 6. 2. 5; 9. 6. 3, and in poetry: Lucr. 3. 484; 823; 972; 5. 98; Hor., C. 3. 29. 29; Ep. 2. 69; Sat. 2. 8. 44; Prop. 3. 11. 5; 22. 42; 4. 4. 63, and Lygd. 3. 36. Inasmuch as the statement has been made that *futurus* was used only with *res*, it is to be especially noted that Cicero uses *futurus* as an adj. not only with *res* but with 20 other substantives.

³ Rarer uses: Vel. 2. 57. 1; 75. 3 *bis*; Pliny, Ep. 3. 18. 2; 6. 2. 2; 9. 3. 10; Pan. 26. 1; 59. 2; 73. 6; 81. 2; Quint. 3. 7. 11; 8. 49; 10. 1. 35; 92; 11. 3. 21; 12. 10. 3; Suet., Iul. 19. 2; 81. 1; Aug. 96. 1; Nero 6. 2; Gell. 14. 1. 33; 36 *bis*; 2. 3; 17. 7. 2; 7, and Sen., Tro. 551; 660; Phoen. 280; Med. 286; H. F. 209; 745; Lucan 4. 204; 710; 5. 179; 7. 374; 389; 9. 581; Val. Fl. 6. 313; 7. 125; Stat., Silv. 4. 3. 18; 5. 3. 176; Th. 6. 293; 12. 760; Argument. 3, 9; Mart. 6. 2. 3; 12. 8. 3; 92. 3; and Juv. 3. 72; 8. 75.

found most frequently in Sil. Ital. 19 (22. 4) and Just. 9 (27. 7), least frequently in Mart. 3 (114. 3), Stat. 5 (141. 4), and Pliny, Nat. 12 (157. 8). The usage of writers other than those recorded in the Table is as follows: Val. Max. 14 (33. 2), Celsus 5 (72. 4), Quint., Decl. 12 (36. 8), Suet. 4 (63. 5), Just. 9 (27. 7), and Gell. 7 (74. 5).

b) *Substantival*.¹ This usage begins with Sall. (Or. Lep. 6) and Cicero in prose, with Verg. and Hor. in poetry, and was used with relatively greater frequency in poetry than in prose.² Of the prose writers it is used, relatively to the number of pages, most often by Tac. (28. 6) and Sen. phil. (34); of the poets most frequently by Lygd. (11), Lucan (23. 3) and Val. Flacc. (35. 7). The usage of writers other than those recorded in the Table is as follows: Celsus 2 (181); Quint., Decl. 3 (147), Suet. 1 (254), Just. 5 (49. 6), Gell. 2 (259. 5), and Sil. Ital. 4 (106. 3); Stat. 10 (70. 7).

The use of *futura* as Nom. (= *res futurae*) is very rare: Cic., Fato 26; 33; P. O. 37 *bis*; Livy 25. 12. 8; Sen., N. Q. 13. 6; Dial. 3. 19. 7; Ep. 99. 5; Lucan 5. 223; Quint. 3. 8. 66.

1) *Futurorum*: this ambiguous form (= *rerum futurarum*) was in general avoided. Cicero, however, who uses *rerum futurarum* 24 times, uses it twice (Att. 15. 4a; Cato M. 78); also Ovid (Met. 13. 722). The other occurrences are in Silver

¹ It is interesting to note that the Latin word from which the common English word "Future" is derived was slow in securing a foothold. Before the Classical Period recourse was generally had to a phrase, *quod restat*, *in reliquum tempus*, *in posteritatem*, etc., or to *posthac*. In Cicero *res futuras* (cf. Nepos 2. 1. 4) is common; Lucr. (3. 914), Hor. (C. 3. 29. 29), Ovid (Met. 15. 834), Cic. (P. O. 111) and Caes. (1. 5. 21) use *futurum tempus*; Lucr. (3. 487), Ovid (Her. 4. 131), Lygd. (4. 47) say *aevum futurum*, and Verg. (A. 8. 627) uses *venturum aevum*. Cicero uses the plural *futura* oftener (51) than the sing. *futurum* (10).

² Classical period: only Sall. (Or. Lep. 6), Cicero 72 (Rhet. 6; Orat. 0; Epist. 9; Phil. 57), and Vitruv. 2 (Pr. 3; 9. 6. 2); poetry Verg. 5 (Geo. 4. 239; 392; Aen. 4. 508; 6. 12; 8. 580), Hor. 4 (Sat. 1. 1. 35; 2. 2. 110; A. P. 172; 218); Lygd. 3. 36; Pan. Mess. 33; Ovid 19. Silver Age note: Sen. rhet. Suas. 3. 37; 4. 1 *ter*; 3; 4; 5. 1; Contr. exc. 2. 7; exc. 9. 6. 19; 10. 5. 16; Livy 15 (2-6-4-3); Celsus 32. 18; 81. 13; Sen. phil. 44 (N. Q. 6; Dial. 11; Ep. 22; Ben. 5); Curt. 4. 1. 29; 8. 2. 1; 6. 16; 9. 33; Suet., Nero 56; Gell. 10. 24. 10; 14. 1. 35; Apul., Apol. 50. 11; Phil. 14. 11; 56. 11; 60. 17; 62. 3; 79. 20; 153. 10; and Sen. trag. 3 (H. F. 10. 70; Thyest. 957; Med. 656); Juv. 6. 556.

Latin: Sen., Suas. 3. 7; 4. 1; Sen., Ben. 3. 4. 2; Quint. 5. 10. 33; Quint. Decl. 208. 20; Tac., Ann. 6. 46. 12; Hist. 1. 38; 4. 69. 13; Pliny, Ep. 7. 27. 2; 9. 13. 11; Just. 11. 11. 2; and Apul., Phil. 60. 17; 79. 20. Cf. p. 283.

2) With Prepositions:

a) *In futurum* is the most common (31) and begins with Ovid (1) and Livy (9). It is later used by Sen. rhet. (1), Celsus (1), Sen. phil. (6), Pliny, Nat. (3), Quint. (1), Q. Decl. (2), Tac. (1), Pliny, Ep. (5) and Just. (1). *In futuro* was used only by Cicero (1), *de futuro* by Cic. (2), Sen. phil. (3), Pliny, Nat. (1), and Gell. (1); *pro futuro* (1) and *ex futuro* (2) only by Sen. phil.

b) *Plural*: the most common is *de futuris* Cic. (3), Sen. phil. (1), Quint. (2), Pliny, Ep. (1). *In futuris* (2) and *ex futuris* (1) are used only by Cicero; *in futura* was used only once, by Justinus, and *in futuros*, only once, by Sallust.

It will be observed that *in futurum* is much more common (31) than *in futura* (1); that between *in futuro* (1) and *in futuris* (2) there is little choice; and the same may be said of *de futuro* (7) and *de futuris* (7).¹

This restricted investigation may serve to exhibit in outline what an important rôle the Future Participle plays in the Latin language. A detailed analysis and discussion of its varied uses and of the various syntactic and stylistic problems they present, together with a complete history of their development, would require a separate and more extended treatment.

EMORY B. LEASE.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

¹ *In futurum*: Ovid, Met. 1. 735; Livy 6. 12. 8; 21. 4. 7; 27. 2. 3; 30. 17. 1; 31. 46. 8; 33. 27. 10; 36. 9. 7; 43. 2. 12; 44. 18. 4; Sen., Contr. 10. 5. 16; Celsus 32. 18; Sen., Dial. 4. 2. 14; 9. 9. 2; Ep. 15. 9; 22. 14; 108. 24; 109. 15; Pliny, Nat. 7. 188; 8. 66; 18. 242; Quint. 7. 4. 18; Quint., Decl. 45. 11; 90. 13; Tac., Ann. 4. 37; Pliny, Ep. 6. 5. 2; 8. 2. 7; 14. 1; 10. 101; 115, and Just. 14. 1. 13. *In futuro*: Cic., Fato 17. *De futuro*: Cic., Fato 13; 17; Sen., Dial. 10. 16. 1; Ep. 100. 4; 101. 5; Pliny, Nat. 11. 7; Gell. 10. 24. 10. *Pro futuro*: Sen., Dial. 9. 11. 2. *Ex futuro*: Sen., Ben. 7. 2. 4; Ep. 101. 9. *De futuris*: Cic., P. O. 10; Leg. 3. 29; Phil. 1. 26; Sen. phil., Ep. 88. 33; Quint. 3. 4. 7; 7. 4. 2; Pliny, Ep. 3. 20. 9. *In futuris*: Cic., Fato 13; 17. *Ex futuris*: Cic., Fin. 1. 62. *In futura*: Just. 1. 10. 16. *In post futuros*: Sall. Or. Lep. 6 (note that the subst. still retains its verbal force and allows *post* to modify it; cf. Gell. 14. 1. 6 *homines res omnis post futuras praeoscere*).

III. PROBLEMS IN DELPHIAN CHRONOLOGY.

The Aitolians and King Antigonos of Makedon practically divided between them the control of Greece from 275-250 B. C. The former of these gained both power and prestige as a result of their defense of the Delphic shrine against the Gauls. They not only regarded Delphi as their peculiar sphere of influence but, as the Aitolian League grew in strength and numbers, they also began to dominate the proceedings of the Amphiktyonic Council. By the time Antigonos had definitely secured his position on the throne, he found himself a hopeless minority at the Council in the number of votes which he controlled. Liable to be outvoted with consequent loss of prestige, he adopted a policy of non-participation which he imposed on all states dependent on Makedon. In studying the Amphiktyonic records of the second half of the third century, we base our chronological scheme on the theory that this policy became traditional in Makedon and was never departed from.¹ Accordingly, when we find Athens sending a delegate to the Council, we assume that the city was independent. No such restrictions were imposed on those states not directly controlled by Makedon but bound to her on the basis of a free and independent alliance. For example, Boiotia, allied to Makedon from the Demetrian war until the end of the century, sent her delegates to the Council save when at war with Aitolia.

The policy of Antigonos was also adopted by the Achaian League and probably for the same reasons. Both may have resented the policy of the Aitolians in regard to Delphi, as well as their unprecedented method of increasing their vote in the Council as they expanded their League. At any rate it is clear that any state possessing an Amphiktyonic vote ceased to exercise it on entering the Achaian League or on coming under Makedonian control.

Between 250 and 240 B. C. Greece enjoyed a period of comparative peace. We should expect to find a goodly number of

¹ The documents from 280-240 are discussed in AJP 1918, 145 ff.

records of the Soteria or of the Council meetings in these years, but we have nothing save a decree in honor of the philosopher Lykon, which probably dates ca. 248. By some curious chance all the other Amphiktyonic lists have disappeared unless we are to transfer to this period some of those which we have dated at the end of the century.

In the following decade war broke out between Aitolia and Demetrios. Since the former suffered severely we should not expect to find many epigraphical records during the war. The ancient historians tell us very little about the struggle beyond the fact that Demetrios won for himself the nickname *Aitolikos*.¹ This implies that the fortunes of war went strongly against the Aitolian forces. Boiotia deserted the League and joined Demetrios early in the war. From an Attic inscription we learn that the war began in the archonship of Lysias and that it was not ended in the archonship of Lysanias.² It may have been brought to an end by the Dardanian invasion of Makedon. At least it is certain that Demetrios was engaged in a desperate struggle with these tribes in the latter part of his reign, was defeated by them, and apparently lost his life in battle or as a result of wounds. Whatever the date of the war, we believe that there can be no reasonable doubt that Aitolia suffered severely, losing part of her League, and that Pomtow and Walek are justified in their arguments for placing Group VI of the Amphiktyonic records in the reign of Demetrios.³

The problem of dating Group VI more precisely is facilitated by several lines of evidence. The succession of certain archons is known. Eukles follows Thessalos and precedes Athambos.⁴ Damaios is followed by Damosthenes who is, with reasonable

¹ Strabo X 451. Niese gives the details of the war in *Gesch. der gr. und mak. Staaten* II 286 ff.

² SIG I^a 485. In line 65 of this inscription it is better to restore *ἐνὶ Λυσανίου* than *ἐνὶ Ἐκφάντου* since elision is followed wherever possible. Ekphantos is dated in 237/6; Lysanias in 236/5 (AJP 1913, 381 ff.).

³ Walek, *Die delphische Amphiktyonie in der Zeit der aitolischen Herrschaft*, 114 ff.; Pomtow, *Klio* 1914, 265 ff.

⁴ *Klio* 1914, 291. Bourguet is inclined to place Eukles about 212 on prosopographical evidence which he publishes in *Rev. Arch.* 1917, 339. This date is much too late and the acceptance of it is impossible because of the violent fluctuation in the membership of the League which is involved in it.

probability, dated in the year of the Pythic games.¹ The membership of the Amphiktyonic Council shows that Boiotia and Aitolia were at peace; that Athens was independent of Makedon in the archonship of Athambos; and that Aigina acted with Athens in asserting her freedom for she had a delegate at the Council in the same archonship.

Walek explains the presence of the Athenian delegate at the Council in the archonship of Athambos as an act of grace on the part of Demetrios. Dating Athambos in 236 he builds up the theory that the war with Aitolia had ended and a hasty peace concluded to enable Demetrios to return home to meet the Dardanians. As a token of the concord established between the two nations, an Athenian delegate was sent to the Council. Pomtow has accepted this theory but it rests on very unsubstantial evidence, or rather, on none at all. The war could not have ended in 236 as the evidence of Attic inscriptions shows.² Moreover we cannot believe that Demetrios ever broke with the traditional policy of Makedon in allowing any of the subject states to participate in the deliberations of the Council. Had he done so, it would be inexplicable that Athens alone should be allowed the privilege. If Demetrios had wished to signify the renewal of amicable relations by sending a delegate to the Council, we should reasonably expect Makedon to have exercised her privilege rather than a subordinate member of the empire. We believe that Walek's theory must be discarded and that the Athenian hieromnemon at the Council in Athambos' year must be explained on the basis of Athenian independence. We have shown elsewhere that Athens shook off the domination of Makedon in 232 and we accordingly date Athambos in that year.³ This we take as the pivotal point for dating Group VI.

Pomtow has given good reasons for dating Thessalos, Eukles, and Athambos in successive years, and they should therefore be dated in 234/2.⁴ Pythokles of Hermione received Delphic honors in the archonship of Thessalos.⁵ In a record of the Soteria he is given as the officiating priest, and it is probable that the honors were conferred in recognition of his services on that occasion.⁶ Accordingly, we should restore the name of

¹ SIG I³ 483.

² SIG I³ 485.

³ AJP 1918, 167 ff.

⁴ Klio 1914, 291 ff.

⁵ Anec. Delph. 66.

⁶ SIG I³ 489.

the archon in this record as Thessalos, for it fills the lacuna in the first line exactly. Six Aitolians, two Delphians, and one Histiaian formed the Amphiktyonic Council which presided over the games. Neither Athens nor Boiotia was represented, and their absence indicates that the Demetrian war was still in progress. Pomtow has suggested that this record should be assigned to the archonship of Damaios, but the list of Amphiktyons does not correspond with that of his year. An Amphiktyonic list recently published by Pomtow probably belongs to the archonship of Athambos, but it may be dated under Damaios.¹ The presence of an Athenian and a Histiaian at the same time limits the list to this period and excludes that of the Chremonidean war.

The Aiginetan hieromnemon does not reappear after the archonship of Athambos in 232. Lyandros (this was the name of the delegate) received an honorary decree from Delphi in the archonship of Eukles in the preceding year.² It is probable that he was present at the spring session of the Council as well. If this is so, it implies that the revolution which gave Athens and Aigina their freedom took place early in the spring of 232. Since Aigina shared the Dorian vote in the Peloponnese with four other states in some kind of rotation, her turn did not come again before she joined the Achaian League.³ By so doing she followed the plan of other members of that League in abstaining from participation in the proceedings of the Council.

Damaios must be dated in a year preceding the celebration of the Pythic games and he is immediately followed by Damos-thenes.⁴ These archons follow Athambos and must be dated in 231/o. Pleiston belongs with Group VI as Walek has shown.⁵

¹ GGA 1913, 174.

² SIG I³ 482, note 8. It may be noted here that in the discussion of Archelas, the archon in 269, it was suggested that the Aiginetan vote in that archonship might be dated ca. 228 (AJP 1918, 162). Further study shows that this is impossible, as there is no place for an archon of this name here. We must either assume that Aigina gained her independence of Makedon in 269 in time to send a delegate to the spring session of the Council or date the decree in honor of the Aiginetan hieromnemon in a much earlier period.

³ The date is undetermined, but is probably not later than 229. Niese, *op. cit.* II 289.

⁴ SIG I³ 483, 488.

⁵ *op. cit.* 115 ff.

It is probable that he is to be dated in 229. After his archonship the Athenian delegate no longer appears in the records of the Council. The reason for the change of policy can only be determined by conjecture. Apparently the Athenians ceased to participate as Amphiktyons as soon as they gained possession of their harbors and fortresses and became completely independent of Makedon. Diogenes surrendered the ports only after a ransom of 150 talents had been paid. Much of this amount was raised from friendly states. Aratos contributed twenty talents, possibly in the hope that Athens would join the Achaian League. Ptolemy probably gave a large contribution in partial recognition of the creation of the tribe Ptolemais. Some came either as a loan or gift from the Thespians and Thebans, a fact which has some significance in regard to the loyalty of these states to their Makedonian allies.¹ Whether these gifts carried any obligations to Athens in regard to Aitolia we cannot say. The guiding statesmen in the new era of freedom were Mikion and Eurykleides, and they must have realized that the only safe policy for Athens was one of strict neutrality. If they joined either of the great leagues they knew that their country would be the main battle-ground in case of war, and they probably saw that trouble was already brewing. Since Aratos did not succeed in winning Athens to the Achaian League Polybios has no sympathy for Athenian foreign policy and he dismisses the Athenians from his history with the contemptuous remark that, when they gained their independence, they resigned it to Eurykleides and concerned themselves no more with the political life of Greece.² We may conclude that the failure of Athens to attend the Council is undoubtedly a part of the policy of neutrality inaugurated by Eurykleides which seems to have been religiously followed for the remainder of his lifetime.

The Boiotian vote at the Council also requires a word of explanation. In the war between Aitolia and Makedon the Boiotians went over to the latter.³ Apparently this move was voluntary, but the presence of a Makedonian army within their borders may have furnished some incentive. If we can believe Polybios, many of the towns seemed to have made the change

¹ IG VII 1737-8, 2405-6; Ferguson, *Hell. Ath.* 207.

² Polybios V 106.

³ Polybios XX 5.

with reluctance. However, Boiotia now appears as an independent ally of Makedon and not as a subject state. During the war no delegates from Boiotia attended the Council, but in 232 we find them present. We may infer that peace had been concluded between 234, the archonship of Thessalos, and 232. It is interesting to observe that Boiotia had none of the scruples which characterized the policy of Makedon in regard to attending the Council. Hereafter the records show the presence of Boiotians at all times except when actual hostilities prevented their attendance.

An interval must elapse between the archonships of Pleiston and Peithagoras because the Amphiktyonic list in the spring term of the former differs from the membership in the autumn session under Peithagoras.¹ Peithagoras probably belongs to a year of the Pythia, although it is not absolutely certain.² If so, he must be dated in 226. We believe that Pomtow is correct in restoring the name of Patrondas in SIG I³ 506, although the first letter of the archon's name is so indistinct that we may restore Euagoras or Peisilas with equal probability. But Patrondas belongs to this period and it is probable that both Euagoras and Peisilas belong in the reign of Demetrios. The constitution of the Council reveals the fact that the Aitolian League had added four votes to their representation since the archonship of Peithagoras. Since the Boiotians were present, the list must antedate the Kleomenic war or 224 B. C. The growth of the Aitolian delegation from seven to eleven shows that the Aitolian League had again entered upon a policy of vigorous expansion. This is probably a result of the compact between Antigonos and Achaia which left Aitolia no longer bound by her former agreements and undertakings with the king.³ It should be noted that the honors paid to the Chian hieromnemon mark the return of the Chians to the Council. The reason for their long absence, or for their return at this particular time, has not been satisfactorily explained. It has been suggested that Aitolia withdrew the privilege after her own great losses in the war with Demetrios and did not restore it until she had regained her former voting power in the Council.

¹ BCH 1902, 250 ff. SIG I³ 494.

² Pomtow, *Jahrb. Phil.* 1894, 530.

³ Polybios II 45-50.

Since Patrondas must precede the Kleomenic war, he is to be dated in 225. Herys is later than Peithagoras as the decrees in honor of Antagoras show.¹ The Boiotians were absent from the Council, so Herys probably belongs between 224 and 222.

This arrangement of the group Thessalos-Herys differs widely from the chronological tables published by Beloch, Walek, or Pomtow. Its validity rests on our theory of the political attitude of Makedon and the Achaian League towards Aitolian domination at Delphi, and in no less degree, on the date which we have given to the revolt of Athens from Makedon. In regard to the latter point, it is only fair that we should consider the problem with reference to the other theory which dates Athenian independence in 229 or 228. In that case Athambos-Damosthenes should be dated in 228-6 or four years later than in our list. Peithagoras and Patrondas would fall in the interval of peace which followed the Kleomenic war and Herys in the Social war. Kallias and Nikarchos would have to be dated between 217 and 212. It is in this last period where we face difficulty. The expansion of the Aitolian League to its maximum power would be assigned to a period when all Greece was in comparative peace, and at a time much later than any historian has ventured to place it. It seems to us that our evidence, scanty and poor at the best, is all against such a late date and it cannot be lightly cast aside. Furthermore the grouping of the Soteric records becomes a very difficult and involved problem. Charixenos falls in an interval of peace and Xennias in wartime, and these *agonothetai* succeed each other in the order named.² Similarly another record of two successive Soteria shows that one was celebrated under peace conditions while the second shows that Boiotia and Aitolia were at war.³ It is clear that all these documents cannot be placed at the beginning of the Makedonian war. Charixenos and Xennias must go back to the beginning of the Social war. Finally, some of the archons, who must be displaced from their present position in 217-212, will have to be dated about the middle of the century at a time when friendly relations between Aitolia and Makedon would permit honorary decrees for citizens of the latter. Prosopographic and epigraphical considerations are against any such change. In general, it may be said that the

¹ SIG I³ 498, 499.

² Klio 1914, 307.

³ BCH 1902, 266, 267.

evidence of the Delphic inscriptions is in favor of the theory dating the independence of Athens in 232.

Our arrangement of the Amphiktyonic lists makes it impossible to date the decree in honor of Lykon ca. 228. Pomtow is undoubtedly correct in assigning this document to the middle of the century or ca. 248.¹

In dating the Amphiktyonic records later than Herys, we are on surer ground. Lists, in which the ethnic adjective is used, are undoubtedly later than those where it is not found. This divides the records into two classes, and is of great service in dating them. Secondly, the presence of Boiotian delegates in any list excludes the possibility of dating it during the Kleomenic, Social, or Makedonic wars. Finally, the growth of the Aitolian League helps to fix the date, or sequence, of some of the records. Unfortunately, the nature of this evidence is very unsatisfactory, and most of us are prone to date our documents first, and then make our deductions about the growth of the League.

In the archonship of Herys the Aitolians had eleven votes, and this number was increased to fourteen under Kallias. In his year the Aitolian League had attained its maximum expansion, although we also find records giving fifteen votes to Aitolia in addition to others which she controlled. Beloch places the period of greatest expansion between 228 and 220.² Walek and Pomtow have been more definite for they date Nikarchos and Kallias in 227-6. According to Beloch, Thessaly was divided between Aitolia and Makedon ca. 228 as a result of the good understanding arrived at early in the reign of Antigonos with Aitolia. If so, the increase in the Aitolian delegation was due to this arrangement. We doubt, however, if such a division was made. When Antigonos had to face a revolt of his troops, he won them over to him by pleading his success in quelling an uprising in Thessaly.³ This plea could not have been made if he had resigned any of that state to Aitolia. Moreover, Thessaly is listed as an ally of Makedon in the Kleomenic war.⁴ Polybios may not mean Thessaly entire, but it is probably the larger part. According to our arrangement of the Amphiktyonic lists Aitolia only controlled eleven votes at

¹ SIG I² 461; GGA 1913, 168.

² Justin XXVIII 3.

³ Gr. Gesch. III 2. 322 ff.

⁴ Polybios IV 9.

the outbreak of the war. She may have added a part of Thessaly contiguous to her own boundaries, but could have controlled only a small part. It should be noted that Thessalian troops took no part in the battle of Sellasia, and in the conference of allies summoned to Corinth in 220 Thessaly was not present nor was she even invited.¹ We may infer that Thessaly abandoned her alliance with Makedon between 223 and 222, and those parts not directly controlled by Makedonian troops joined the Aitolian League. If this is the case, Aitolia could have commanded fourteen votes about 223 or 222. During the Social war Larisa, Demetrias, Pharsalos, Pherai, and other towns whose names are unknown were controlled by Philip.² Skotussa,³ Lamia,⁴ Thebai Phthiotikai and Meliteia⁵ are mentioned by name as Aitolian. Philip failed in an attack on Meliteia⁶ but was more successful against Phthiotic Thebes which he recaptured and refounded under the name of Philipopolis.⁷ The dispossessed Thebans were given land in Lokris by Aitolia⁸ and it is probable that in going to their new home the colonists believed that they alone had the right to the Amphiktyonic membership, which thus remained under the control of the League. During the war the Thessalian plain was held at times by the troops of Philip, for Dorimachos found his way barred by them once when he attempted a raid on Makedon, and so he ventured no farther than the mountains on the border. On the whole the war seems to have been indecisive and in 217, on the intercession of friendly neutrals, peace was concluded on the basis of the map.⁹ It is probable that very little, if any, change was made in the membership of the Aitolian League.

Between 222 and 217 we place the archons Nikarchos, Kallias, and the agonothete Xennias. Fourteen Aitolians appeared in the Council in the records for these years, implying that the League had attained her maximum extent. This, we believe, is due to the defection of Thessaly before the battle of Sellasia. Since the Boiotians are also present at the Council in both archonships, we must date Nikarchos and Kallias in the interval of

¹ Polybios II 65; IV 15, 25.

² SIG I^a 501.

³ Polybios V 97, 99.

⁴ Polybios V 99, 100.

⁵ Polybios V 100, 103, 105.

⁶ Polybios V 99.

⁷ SIG I^a 536.

⁸ Polybios V 27, 97.

⁹ Livy XXVIII 7.

peace. Pomtow shows that Xennias is later than Kallias,¹ and since the Boiotians are absent when he presided over the Soteria, Xennias must be dated during the Social war, probably in the year immediately following Kallias.

We have set forth elsewhere our reasons for believing that there were two archons named Nikarchos, one of whom must antedate the creation of the tribe Ptolemais at Athens.² The results of our investigations in the later period substantiate this theory, for Nikarchos II cannot be earlier than 223 when it is certain that Ptolemais existed at Athens. It should be noted here that Pomtow has recently dated the archon Archelas in ca. 238.³ The hieromnemons under Nikarchos were Hippon and Antandros. Both names appear as senators under Archelas and it is evident that they are the same men. If Pomtow is correct in dating Archelas so early, Nikarchos II must be identified with Nikarchos I and dated along with him in 240. In other words, it would be necessary to assume that the Aitolian League had attained its maximum growth at the beginning of the reign of Demetrios. Such a theory has some merit, for it is not impossible, and it might be used to explain the origin of the war between Demetrios and Aitolia. On the other hand, it would be necessary to explain the presence of the Boiotian delegates at the Council. After the battle of Chaironeia Boiotia would have surrendered her votes to Aitolia, if we may judge by Aitolian practice elsewhere. But it is uncertain whether she became a member of the League or joined Aitolia on the basis of an independent ally. If the latter, she would have retained her voting privileges. However, with the evidence now at our command, we prefer to date Archelas and Nikarchos much later. The Amphiktyonic decree from the archonship of the latter confers honors on two men whose ethnic is given as Aigieus. If these men are citizens of Aigion, the capital of the Achaian League, the decree must be dated at a time when Aitolia was on friendly terms with the League. Very soon after the end of the Kleomenic war, Aitolia began openly to plot against Achaia, and strained relations would have prevented the Council from honoring Achaians. Accordingly, the honorary decree must have been passed immediately on the conclusion of the war or else some years later, after the Social war. We have already

¹ *Klio* 1914, 306-7.

² *AJP* 1918, 165.

³ *Klio* 1917, 43.

shown that it is difficult to date Nikarchos in the later period, and we therefore prefer to place him immediately at the close of the Kleomenic war.

In the peace which followed the Social war we date two records of the Soteria.¹ In the Amphiktyonic lists the ethnic adjective is not given and the Boiotians are present at the Council. The number of Aitolian delegates shows that the League had expanded slightly, and we believe that these documents should be placed as near the beginning of the Makedonian war as possible. We have accepted the restorations of Nikitsky and Pomtow by which Aitolia is given fifteen delegates at the Council. It is possible that only fourteen were present, for the very fragmentary condition of the documents does not allow exact determination.

In the Amphiktyonic records belonging to the last period, the Aitolians adopted the practice of giving the place of origin of their delegates. Fortunately we can determine when they introduced this plan. An inscription from Delphi gives two lists which undoubtedly belong in successive years.² In the first of these the Boiotians were present at the Council, and absent in the second. We must infer from this that war had broken out in the interval between the two celebrations of the Soteria. There is no doubt that the document falls at the beginning of the Makedonian war, since the Kleomenic and Social wars are excluded from consideration. The alliance between Rome and Aitolia was formed at the end of the campaigning season in 212, or after the performance of the Soteria in that year. Livy tells us that the Roman commander who negotiated the alliance, returned from Aitolia to his winter-quarters, and that Philip heard the news while wintering in Pella.³ Accordingly, we may date the first of these Amphiktyonic records in 212 and the second in 211. Since the ethnic adjective is found in the second and not in the first, we may date the new custom in 211. Aitolia apparently inaugurated the plan as a means of conferring honor on those individuals or states which had rendered conspicuous service to the League. In some cases citizens of states not members of the League were appointed as Aitolian hieromnemons. These were probably pro-Aitolians who were living at the time in exile within the bounds of the League. We do

¹ Cf. p. 298.

² BCH 1902, 266-7.

³ Livy XXVI 24, 25.

not understand the Aitolian practice in reference to Kephallene. Beginning with 212, citizens of this island were sometimes named as members of the Aitolian delegation, and sometimes they are recorded independently. The latter is an unusual departure from custom, for Kephallene apparently remained a part of the League.

The history of the Makedonian war is particularly obscure, especially in its relation to the membership of the Aitolian League. Akarnania, Epeiros, Boiotia, Phokis (probably only in part), and Euboia were the northern states of Greece allied with Philip at the beginning.¹ Thessaly refused to join him at first but is numbered amongst the allies at the end.² In a speech of the Rhodian (?) mission in 207, the orator gives Boiotia, Euboia, Phokis, Lokris, Thessaly, and Epeiros on the side of Makedon.³ We may allow for considerable rhetorical exaggeration in the speech, for it is clear that parts of Phokis, Lokris, and Thessaly were held by Aitolia. It is possible that the same is true of Boiotia, for the speaker goes on to say that, when the war with Hannibal is over, Rome will direct its whole power against Greece: *professedly, indeed, in aid of the Boiotians against Philip*. This is a very strange statement, for we cannot understand why Boiotia should be made the pretext when Rome was already allied with Aitolia in a war against Philip. It may be that the text of the passage is corrupt. If not, we must assume that part of Boiotia, which was not, at all times, enthusiastic about the Makedonian alliance, had appealed to Rome for help. In the final treaty of peace between Philip and Rome Livy gives the allies of the former as Prusias, Achaia, Boiotia, Thessaly, Akarnania, and Epeiros: of the latter as Ilium, Attalos, Pleuratos, Nabis, Eliís, Messenia, and Athens.⁴ The inclusion of Ilium and Athens in the latter is probably incorrect.⁵ Lokris and Phokis are not mentioned on either side. The treaty of the previous year may have divided them up between Makedon and Aitolia, and they, therefore, could have no voice in the second treaty. In summing up the war, Niese concludes that both sides won and lost about the same, and that accounts balanced pretty evenly.⁶

¹ Polybios X 41.

² Polybios XI 5.

³ Niese, *op. cit.* II 502, note 4.

⁴ Livy XXVI 25; XXIX 12.

⁵ Livy XXIX 12.

⁶ *op. cit.* II 502 ff.

From the Amphiktyonic records it appears that Aitolia lost two (or three, if we include the Kephallenian vote as controlled by the League) votes at the Council in the first year of the war. This is due to Philip's successful campaigns against the Dolopians and in their vicinity.¹ Thereafter the League controlled 13 (14 in 208) votes. Walek believes that Aitolia exercised the vote of every state which had ever belonged to the League even though it had ceased to be a member. The variations in the numbers of the Aitolian delegation during the war discredit the theory, although we are willing to admit that Aitolia was probably very liberal in interpreting the geographical boundaries of a voting state. In Phokis, in Lokris, and in the north the Aitolian holdings were probably slight at times but they gave a technical right to exercise the votes held by those states.

The following arrangement of the Amphiktyonic lists between 214 and 202 is suggested:

- 213 Agonotheteadas (BCH 1902, 265; Klio 1914, 306, 307).
 15 (?) Aitolians, (1 Chian), (2 Delphians), 2 Boiotians.
- 212 (BCH 1902, 266; Klio 1914, 307).
 15 (?) Aitolians, (1 Chian), 1 Kephallenian, 2 Boiotians, (2 Delphians).
- 211 Agonothete Letos (BCH 1902, 267, 268; Klio 1914, 306, 307; SIG 1^a 523).
 13 Aitolians, 2 Delphians, 1 Chian.
- 209 Archon Babylos (SGDI 2528).
 12 Aitolians, 1 Chian, 2 Delphians, 1 Athamanian.
- 208 Archon Damokrates, General Lattamos (Fouilles de Delphes III 2.86; Klio 1914, 309; BCH 1902, 270).
 F. 11 Aitolians, 1 Athenian, 1 Ambrakiote, 1 Kephallenian, 1 Chian.
 S. 12 Aitolians, 2 Delphians, 1 Athenian, 1 Chian, 1 Tanagran.
- 206 (Fouilles de Delphes III 1.351) General Agelaos (?)
 12 Aitolians, 1 Chian, 2 Delphians, (1 Athenian).

¹ Niese, *op. cit.* II 484.

205 Archon Megartas, General Alexandros (Fouilles de Delphes III 2.134).

12 Aitolians, 2 Delphians, 1 Chian, 1 Magnesians, 1 Athenian.

203 Archon Polykleitos (SGDI 2527)

12 Aitolians, 2 Delphians, 1 Chian, 2 Boiotians, 1 Athenian.

202 Archon Philaitolos (SGDI 2529)

11 Aitolians, 1 Kephallenian, 2 Delphians, 1 Athenian, 2 Boiotians, 1 Magnesians, 1 Chian.

Babylos can be placed with reasonable certainty in 209. In this year the king of the Athamanians rendered conspicuous service to the League in his efforts to secure peace, and was undoubtedly rewarded by a vote in the Council.¹

Ambrakos was taken by a force of Aitolians and Romans in 208. Philip recovered the place shortly afterwards.² The only occasion during the Makedonian war when an Ambrakiot could have held an independent vote must be the fall of 208. The decree dated by the general Lattamos must therefore be assigned to this session of the Amphiktyons. It may be noted that Ambrakia was apparently not enrolled as a member of the League but was given an independent status. This may be due to the influence of Rome, and if so, it is an interesting indication of what was destined to be Rome's policy in Greece.

The Athenian delegate reappears at the Council in 208, and the unusual honors paid to him probably mark that event.³ Why Athens departed from the traditional policy of Euryklöides at this time we cannot tell. It is possible that his death may be dated about this period and Athenian policies had passed into other hands. The influence of Rome may have been brought to bear on Athens to abandon her neutrality and help Aitolia which was hard pressed. There is a record of a treaty between these two states which may belong here, although Pomtow is inclined to place it ca. 220 or 201.⁴ If it is dated in 208, Livy is right after all in naming Athens as an ally of Rome in the

¹ Livy XXVII 30.

² Appian, *Maced. bell.* 3; Niese, *op. cit.* II 493.

³ Fouilles de Delphes III 2. 86.

⁴ *Klio* 1917, 7. If this treaty does not belong in 208, we prefer to date it ca. 201.

treaty of Phoinike. The new policy of Athens was consistently followed in the succeeding years, for an Athenian is present at all meetings of the Council for which we have complete records.

The absence of the Delphians in the fall session of 208 cannot be satisfactorily explained. The decree for the Athenian delegate is dated; first by the Aitolian general; and second, by the Delphic archon. The phrase ἀρχων ἐν Δελφοῖς may mean that this session of the Council was not held at Delphi but elsewhere. It is possible that Delphi was beset by Philip's troops, and her delegates were prevented from attending by the necessities of war.

The archon Dam(okrat)es must be later than 211 because of the method of listing the Aitolian Amphiktyons. We believe that the presence of the Athenian hieromnemon is a sufficient reason for dating the decree from the archonship of Damokrates later than Lattamos or in the spring session of the same year. Against this may be urged the fact that the name of the secretary of the Council is omitted, although the practice of recording it had begun again under Babylos. Furthermore, if both decrees are assigned to different sessions of the Council in 208, the Athenian delegate must have been changed in the course of the year in conformity with Aitolian practice, although this change may be due to other causes. The presence of a Tanagran at the Council in this year is noteworthy. He is not to be regarded as a representative of Boiotia, but rather, of a part of the confederation which had been detached and was temporarily allied with Aitolia.¹ For this reason the Tanagrans are granted a vote of their own. A citizen of Lebadeia is also recorded amongst the Aitolian delegation. This does not necessarily imply that this state had also joined the Aitolians, although that is possible, but we prefer to believe that the Lebadeian was some pro-Aitolian exiled for his political beliefs and now resident within the bounds of the League.

The Amphiktyonic record which we have dated in 206 belongs to a year in which the Pythia were celebrated. The list is very fragmentary, but it is probable that we should restore the name of one Athenian in line 5. There is a lacuna of fully 16 letters after the full restoration of the formula for the

¹ Secession of part of Boiotia to the Aitolian League is indicated by the speech of the Rhodian ambassador. Cf. p. 297.

secretary is made. The contents of the document show that peace had come between Boiotia and Aitolia, although, contrary to their wont, no delegates from the former were present. If we are correct in believing that a part of the Boiotian confederacy had joined Aitolia, they may have absented themselves as a protest against the action of the League. In the archonship of Polykleitos, however, we find the Boiotians in their old position in the Council.

A Magnesians appears at the Council in the archonship of Megartas. The Aitolians conferred this vote in the second generalship of Agelaos.¹ The date is much disputed. This general held office for the first time in 217. Then, he was a strong advocate of peace, and his election was likely due to his efforts in securing it. If he still represents the same party in Aitolia, he probably falls at the end of the Makedonian war. Moreover, it is doubtful if the Magnesians would press for recognition of their festival in honor of Artemis at a time when the Greek mainland was torn by widespread war. Kolbe dates the arrival of Magnesian ambassadors in the Peloponnese ca. 205, and it is probable that the visit to Aitolia took place at the same time.² We date Agelaos in 206 and Megartas in the following year.³

Philaitolos belongs to a year when the Pythia were celebrated, and, as he is later than Megartas, he must be dated in 202. Polykleitos may belong in 204 or 203.

The arrangement of the Amphiktyonic lists which we have adopted for the last half of the third century requires the regrouping of the other archons of this period. For most of these the chronological evidence is slight, although we are better informed on the political affiliations of the Greek states between 240 and 200. In some cases we are compelled to rely upon the vague and indecisive evidence furnished by prosopography.

Kallikles is dated by Pomtow ca. 238. We have also dated Euagoras and Peisilas in the period of the Demetrian war because the decrees from their years show that Aitolia and the Achaian League were on friendly terms. There is no place

¹ *Inschriften von Magnesia*, p. XIV.

² *IG V* p. XXV.

³ Alexandros was general in the archonship of Megartas (*Fouilles de Delphes III* 2. 134).

for these archons later, when similar conditions prevailed, unless we are to displace some of the documents which we have assigned to 217-212.

Colin denies the existence of three archons named Eudokos in the third century and Pomtow is inclined to accept his conclusions.¹ Since a large number of decrees for Aitolian allies in the Peloponnese were passed in this archonship, we believe that it is better to date them in the Demetrian war as recognition of services rendered during the struggle. Eudokos III should be dated about 236-5 or at the end of the war. It is probable that Athanion should be assigned to the same period. Baunack would date this archon after Thessalos because of the order in which the inscriptions follow each other on the stone.² This is not decisive proof, for the upper one might have been cut later.

The decrees from the archonship of Eudoros show that Makedon and Achaia were both on friendly terms with Aitolia.³ They must be dated early in the reign of Antigonos, and it is probable that Eudoros is the immediate successor of Pleiston.

Lyson is later than the creation of the tribe Ptolemais at Athens and earlier than the outbreak of the Kleomenic war. The latter is shown by the decree for a citizen of Stymphalos, a state which remained steadily loyal to the Achaian League.⁴ If Peithagoras belongs to a year of the Pythia, Lyson must go in 227.

We believe that we should distinguish two archons named Xenokles. In one semester there is a decree for a Megalopolitan who is also called an Arcadian.⁵ This double designation is never found in the second half of the century after Megalopolis joined the Achaian League. The last example occurs in the archonship of Charixenos in 267. This decree should therefore be dated in a period when Megalopolis was still a member of the Arkadian federation, or about 275. Xenokles II belongs to the latter part of the century for epigraphical and proso-

¹ SIG I³ 418, note 21.

² SGDI II p. 694.

³ Fouilles de Delphes III 2. 83, 84; SGDI 2635.

⁴ Fouilles de Delphes III 2. 76; SGDI 2788.

⁵ Fouilles de Delphes III 1. 36.

pographical reasons. In his year of office a citizen of Pheneos was honored by Delphi. Since this state joined Sparta in the Kleomenic war,¹ and was probably returned to the League of the Achaeans at its close, we should date Xenokles II during the struggle. The only place available is 223. Another alternative is to substitute him for one of the archons in 217-212.

There is very little evidence for an exact dating of the archons between 220 and 212. Pomtow says that Archelas precedes Phainis.² The latter probably belongs in 217 or the end of the Social war. Several citizens of different states are honored in one decree, and it is a reasonable inference that they are mercenaries who served in the war.³ Aristion II, Alexarchos, and Battos must be dated in the interval of peace which followed the war.⁴ Kriton and Xenon may be contemporaneous with the archon Chairephon at Athens, when embassies passed between the latter state and Aitolia.⁵ Of Phrikidas nothing definite can be said at present.⁶ Pomtow places him ca. 219.

Bourguet shows that Anaxandridas precedes Nikodamos, although it is not necessary to assume that the two archons are in consecutive years. Nikodamos does not belong to a year of the Pythic games, if a decree from his archonship is correctly restored.⁷ Both of these men probably held office at the beginning of the Makedonian war. Pomtow dates Archelaos during the Social war but we believe that he should more fittingly be placed during the Makedonian war.⁸ The decrees from his archonship in honor of the Aitolian *epimeletai* imply that they were of great service in defending the shrine. During the Social war Delphi was not in danger, but Philip was more daring in the second war and made many successful dashes into Aitolian territory. The honorary decrees for Messenian mercenaries imply that the League was compelled to call upon her Peloponnesian allies for assistance. These decrees were

¹ Ibid. III 1. 39-42; Plutarch, Kleom. 17; Arat. 39.

² The Amphiktyonic decree published by Pomtow in *Klio* 1914, 308, may belong in the archonship of Archelas or Aristion.

³ SGDI 2609.

⁴ BCH 188e, 234: 1899, 554; SGDI 2625-6.

⁵ IG II 619b.

⁶ *Klio* 1917, 40 ff.

⁷ Fouilles de Delphes III 1. 327.

⁸ *Klio* 1917, 41 ff.

passed in the archonship of Alexeas and he is probably to be dated in the year following Damokrates or else at the close of the war. We follow Pomtow in dating Alexeas in 207 and Kalleidas in 206.¹

In the archonship of Kallieros the Attic Tetrapolis received an honorary decree, apparently in connection with the Pythiastai. If so, the decree must be dated when Greece was at peace. Kallieros probably falls between 206 and 201.

The chronological arrangement of the Amphiktyonic records and of the Delphic archons which we have endeavored to establish differs from those formerly proposed in many important details. The validity of our results rests on two political principles: first, that no member of the Makedonian Empire or of the Achaian League ever participated in the proceedings of the Amphiktyonic Council while it was dominated by Aitolia; secondly, when we find any state represented at the Council, that state must be free from Makedonian control at the time. There can be no doubt that Antigonos Gonatas pursued a policy of non-participation in the Council during his long reign, and the results of our investigations persuade us that his successors did the same. In approaching the study of the Amphiktyonic records from the point of view of these principles, the interdependence of Athenian and Delphian documents cannot be overestimated. For example, the date and length of the Chremonidean war can be determined accurately only by a study of both. In like manner the dates of groups II and VI of the Council's records are closely bound up with the problem of Athenian independence. Finally, the dates of certain Delphic archons and of the creation of the tribe Ptolemais at Athens are determined by a study of both, for the problems are interdependent. Even if these studies have served no other purpose, we hope that they may help to emphasize the close relation of the epigraphical records of Delphi and Athens in the most obscure period of their history.

DELPHIAN ARCHONS, SENATORS, AND HIEROMNEMONS.

239 *Peisilas* S. Agelochos, Euphrantos, Chairikon.

238 *Kallikles* S. Kriton, Pleiston, Achaimenes, Hippias, Kleon.
S. Damaios, Eurymedes, Xenodamos, Straton,
Kraton.

¹ GGA 1913, 157.

- 237 *Euagoras* S. Damarchos, Teledamos, Dexippos.
 236 *Athanion* S. Praochos, Xenon, Chares, Menes.
 235 *Eudokos* III S. Alkamenes, Lyson, Aischriondas, Nikias,
 Menandros.
 234 *Thessalos* S. Agathinos, Kriton, Aristokrates, Amyntas,
 Iatadas.
 S. Hagnias, Eukles, Parnassios, Aristarchidas.
 H. Eupolis, Kallikles.
 233 *Eukles* S. Kleomantis, Athambos, Herakleidas, on.
 S. Xenodokos, Thrasy machos, Aristagoras, Menes,
 Agetor.
 232 *Athambos* S. Aristagoras, Damon, Pleiston, Nikias.
 S. Nikodamos, Kleoxenos.
 (H. Chares, Xenon)
 231 *Damaïos* S. Hagion, Aristokles, Amynandros, Athanion,
 Dioskouridas.
 S. Nikodamos, Amyntas.
 H. Chares, Xenon, Hagnias, Damarmenos.
 230 *Damosthenes* S. Archon, Praochos, Parnassios.
 S. Thrasy machos, Praxias, Kleon, Lysima-
 chos, Amphistratos.
 H. Hagnias, Damarmenos.
 229 *Pleiston* S. Aristomachos, Eparmostos, Dropidas, Straton,
 Archiadidas.
 S. Archidamos, Alkinos, Eudokos, krates.
 H. Iasimachos, Epicharidas, Ar
 228 *Eudoros* S. Diodoros, Pleiston, Echekratidas, Amphion
 (?), ra
 S. Erasippos, Nikarchos, Aristion.
 227 *Lyson* S. Thrasykles, Kleon, Aristomachos, Sotion.
 S. Aristion, Asopodoros, Philondas.
 226 *Peithagoras* H. Lyson, Zakyntios.
 225 *Patrondas* S. Lyson, Nikias, Dion, Gnosilas, Euthydikos.
 S. Erasippos.
 H. Archippos, Herakleidas.
 224 *Herys* S. Archelas, Boulon.
 H. Polyon, Diodoros.
 223 *Xenokles* II S. Anaxandridas, Larisios, Xenodokos.
 222 *Nikarchos* II H. Hippon, Antandros.
 221 *Kallias* H. Nikias, Orestas.

- 220 *Archelas* S. Alexarchos, Hippon, Antandros, Aiakidas, Kallikon.
(H. Mnason, Babylos.)
- 219 *Kriton* S. Kallikrates, Phainis, Archelaos, Diodoros, Chairikon.
S. Pythophanes, Mesatas, Zakynthios.
- 218 *Xenon* S. Kalligenes, Aristoboulos, A
- 217 *Phainis* S. Echekratidas, Eukles, Euthydikos, Kraton, Kleon.
- 216 *Aristion* S. Aristagoras, Rhodios, Eukrates,ondas.
S. Nikaïos, Hagion, Kallikon.
- 215 *Alexarchos* S. Damotimos, Teledamos, Sokrates, Eukles, Euthydikos.
S. Phainis, Archiadas, Hagion.
- 214 *Battos* S. Kleudamos, Orestas, Archon, Zeneas, Apollonios.
- 213 *Phrikidas* S. Lysagoras, Emmenidas, Aristomachos, Pleiston, Babylos.
- 212 *Anaxandridas* S. Hippon, Mnasiatheos, Nikias, Polyon, Ateisidas.
- 211 *Nikodamos* S. Ariston, Nikodamos, Pleiston, Xenon, Epicharidas.
S. Amyntas, Kleotimos, Etymondas, Amyntas,os.
H. Philoxenos, Herakleidas.
- 210 *Archelaos* S. Tarantinos, Glaukos, Babylos, Orthaios, Nikodamos.
S. Archiadas, Kalligenes, Euaggelos, A
- 209 *Babylos* H.goras.
- 208 *Damokrates* S. Hagion, Aristomachos, Eudoros, Alexarchos.
S. Herakon, Andronikos.
H. Herias, Lysi
- 207 *Alexeas* S. Lysimachos, Archelas, Lysidamos, Euthydikos, Archelas.
- 206 *Kalleidas* S. Boulon, Aristagoras, Ekephylos, Lysimachos, Aristoboulos.
H. Teledamos, Emmenidas.

- 205 Megartas S. Mnasiatheos, Protarchos, Athambos, Philinos,
Nikoboulos.
H. Praochos, Patreas.
- 204 *Kallieros* S. Parnassios, Archon, Aristomachos, Kleo-
damos, Eucharidas.
- 203 Polykleitos S. eles.
H. Parnassios, Babylos.
- 202 Philaitolos H. Aristomachos, Kallikrates.

ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

IV. SATURA REDIVIVA.

According to Livy,¹ the purpose of the first Roman approaches to drama was apotropaic. To drive away pestilence, the Romans naturally had recourse to their great masters in magic, the Etruscans. To gain an idea of the symbolic dances introduced by the imported *histriones*, we have only to recall the paintings of many an Etruscan tomb—for example, the Grotta del Triclinio at Corneto.

Livy then explains that the Roman youth "began to imitate" this Etruscan rite. The imitation cannot have been close; for the Roman ceremony was combined with recitation, whereas the fundamental characteristic of the Etruscan performance had been that *carmina* were entirely lacking.

This recitation was humorous and gestures which served to emphasize the humorous element were added.² Furthermore, the "verses" of the young men do not seem to have been set to music. Livy says carefully "*iocularia fundentes*

¹7, 2. For the sake of clearness, it may perhaps be well to quote in full the passages pertinent to my discussion.

3 . . . cum uis morbi nec humanis consiliis nec ope diuina leuaretur, . . . ludi quoque scaenici . . . inter alia caelestis irae placamina instituti dicuntur.

4. ceterum parua quoque, ut ferme principia omnia, et ea ipsa peregrina res fuit. sine carmine ullo, sine imitandorum carminum actu ludiones, ex Etruria acciti, ad tibicinis modos saltantes haud indecoros motus more Tusco dabant.

5. imitari deinde eos iuuentus simul inconditis inter se iocularia fundentes versibus coepere, nec absoni a voce motus erant.

6. accepta itaque res saepiusque usurpando excitata. vernaculis artificibus, quia ister Tusco verbo ludio vocabatur, nomen histrionibus inditum;

7. qui non, sicut ante, Fescennino versu similem incompositum temere ac rudem alternis iaciebant, sed inpletas modis saturas descripto iam ad tibicinem cantu motuque congruenti peragebant.

² Livy does not imply, as Ullman thought (C. Ph. IX 2 and 3), that the *iocularia* were intended to burlesque the Etruscan performance. Rather, as *simul* (Par. 5) shows, the *iocularia* and their attendant *motus* were coincident with the dance, but not a part of the imitation.

versibus," and later (Par. 7), in describing a subsequent development, he remarks, "descripto iam ad tibicinem cantu", which certainly implies that the previous "chant" had not been "arranged for the flute-accompaniment".¹

The phrase "nec absoni a uoce motus erant" (Par. 5) is a curious one for Livy to use in describing the gestures of the *iuuentus*. *Nec absoni* is not at all a simple litotes for *congruentes*, but as Ullman² has seen, is intended to contrast with the "haud indecoros motus" of the Etruscans. Livy indeed seems guardedly to be expressing his disapproval of the comic element in the young men's performance; that is, he, or his source, did not comprehend its prophylactic purpose.

Noticeable also is the fact that although Livy shows that he regards the *iocularia* and the *motus* as a separate ceremony which the Romans combined with the dance of the Etruscans, he does not state that this ceremony had ever had a prior existence. Here the account of Valerius Maximus is of the greatest importance, for it fortunately enables us to fill the gaps of Livy's narrative.

According to Valerius,³ "placandi caelestis numinis gratia compositis carminibus vacuas aures praebuit . . . uerum, ut est mos hominum paruula initia pertinaci studio prose-quendi, uenerabilibus erga Deos uerbis iuuentus rudi atque in-composito motu corporum iocabunda gestus adiecit, eaque res ludium ex Etruria arcessendi causam dedit: cuius decora pernicitas . . . nouitate grata Romanorum oculos permulsit."

Here we have what was doubtless the original rite: a solemn

¹ Cf. Weissenborn's comment on 7, 2, 7:—"Von diesen rohen Versuchen, . . . sind die von L. im folgenden beschriebenen Versuche verschieden durch ihren Inhalt, dadurch dass sie mit Gesang verbunden waren . . ."

Interpret *iam* as equivalent to *tandem* (cf. Ter. And. 1, 2, 19; Tac. Ann. 2, 21, and *iam tandem* in Livy 22, 12, 10). This is apparently the interpretation of Hendrickson (A. J. P., XV, 12).

² L. c.

³ 2, 4, 4. Valerius has been strangely neglected by writers on the *saturnia*, who usually regard him as a mere paraphraser of Livy. The "Programm" of Orendi (M. Terentius Varro, die Quelle zu Livius VII. 2, Bistritz, 1891) should have corrected this impression, if indeed a glance at the texts in question were not sufficient. This Knapp has seen (A. J. P., XXXIII, 125, footnote).

carmen to avert the anger of the gods as shown in the pestilence. This chant the young men subjected to ridicule.¹

One point in the narrative calls for special comment. *iocabunda* has uniformly, I think, been regarded as feminine and taken with *iuventus*.² But Orendi's paper has created at least a strong presumption in favor of the theory that Livy and Valerius in their descriptions of the rise of the drama on Roman soil are following a common source. Valerius, however, begins logically with the original rite which, he informs us, the young men turned to ridicule; whereas Livy, by omitting these antecedent stages, is forced, as Ullman³ observed with surprise, to start his narrative by recording what the performance of the Etruscans was *not* like ("sine carmine ullo", etc.). With Valerius, the contribution of the *iuventus* preceded the introduction of the Etruscan dancers; Livy, on the other hand, describes the combination of the *iocularia* with the imported performance. But if in this reference, Livy, as Orendi has plausibly argued, is following (though at this point less accurately⁴) the same source which Valerius used in writing his fuller account, then Valerius's *iocabunda* is parallel to Livy's *iocularia* and is therefore neuter.⁵

¹ We may compare the mocking parodies of proud boasts which we find in the triumph-song quoted by Suetonius, Caes. 49.

² To make sense, editors have been forced to odd translations. The editor of the Delphin edition paraphrases,—"iuventus ludens verbis in Deorum honorem compositis." Michaut (Tréteaux latins, Paris 1912, p. 55) says, "la jeunesse, qui prend plaisir aux danses rustiques et désordonnées." That both these translations are incorrect is apparent from the examples quoted by Draeger (Historische Syntax I, 357), who cites accusatives, genitives and datives following adjectives in *-bundus*, but no ablatives. Orendi (p. 13) paraphrases, "Die Jugend, die selbst bei ernsten Gelegenheiten den Scherz nicht missen kann", which is surely making *iocabunda* do a hard day's work.

³ Op. cit., p. 9. Ullman gives a different explanation for this peculiar order.

⁴ In the account of the *satura*, on the contrary, Livy is of course far less abbreviated and inaccurate than Valerius.

⁵ Two difficulties complicate this interpretation. First, the asyndeton (*iocabunda gestus*). This may be classified under the head of the *asyndeton enumeratiuum* of Draeger (II 193; cf. Livy 10, 4, 2 and 32, 3, 5, etc.). Second, in the Latin accessible to us, adjectives in *-bundus* are, so far as I can discover, not used as neuter substantives, though

Assuming this view to be correct, one may compare with the *iocularia* the parodies of the Catholic liturgy which formed a part of the mediaeval Festival of Fools.¹ One may also instance the burlesque of tragedy which a certain type of satyr-drama presented. This last example is especially suggestive, inasmuch as the *exodia*, which Livy (7, 2, 11) tells us were direct descendants of the *iocularia*, were also often travesties of tragedies.²

But we have still to deal with the usual interpretation of *iocabunda* as feminine. Granting that this is correct, we must acknowledge a divergence between Livy and Valerius and admit the possibility that Valerius's account may be more accurate. In this case we must infer that the young men repeated the solemn words of the *carmen*, adding gestures which to the writer who described the performance made the ceremony ridiculous.

Here we may find analogies in many an "expulsion of evils" among primitive people.³ For example, among the Hos of Togoland the town is cleansed of evils by an elaborate procedure⁴ in the course of which "the women sweep out their houses and hearths and set the sweepings on broken wooden plates. Many put on torn mats or torn clothes. . . . While they do so, they pray, saying, 'All ye sicknesses which are in our body and plague us, we are come this day to cast you out!' When they set out so to do, the priest commands every man to cry out thrice and thereby to smite himself on

neuters in agreement are common enough (e. g. *moribunda* (*membra*), Verg. Aen. 6, 732; *errabunda* (*vestigia*), Ecl. 6, 58; *errabundum* (*agmen*), Curt. 8, 4, 6; *cunctabunda* (*uerba*) Mamert. in Jul. 18, 6). Cooper (Word Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius, New York, 1895, p. 93) points out that such adjectives are specially characteristic of archaic Latin. Can Valerius from whom Cooper quotes only one other adjective of this formation, be borrowing *iocabunda*, directly or indirectly, from an archaic account? Livy, though he liked adjectives in *-bundus*, was possibly reluctant to employ the neuter substantive of this formation, which was certainly rare in the Latin of his day.

¹ Frazer, Golden Bough, Part VI, The Scapegoat (1913), p. 335.

² Dieterich, Pulcinella, p. 110; Marx in Pauly-Wissowa, Bd. II, p. 1920; but cf. Skutsch in Pauly-Wissowa, Bd. VI, p. 1688.

³ Frazer op. cit., chs. III ff.

⁴ Frazer p. 207. For a Roman parallel, cf. Ovid Fasti, 5, 431 ff., the description of the ritual used at the Lemuria.

the mouth. In a moment they all cry out, smite themselves on the mouth, and run as fast as their legs can carry them in the direction of Mount Adaklu. As they run, they say, 'Out to-day! Out to-day! What kills anybody, out to-day! Ye evil spirits, out to-day!'" etc.¹

If then by the *iocularia* Livy refers inaccurately to the verses of the *carmen* illustrated by 'humorous' gestures, we can perhaps understand why he uses (Par. 7) the phrase "*Fescennino versu similem (versum)*" in referring to them. In form the *carmen* would be similar to the *versus Fescennini*, and its intent was obviously identical; but in substance its words would be serious, not ridiculous like the mockery of the ordinary Fescennines.

At any rate, whether the young men travestied the *carmen* by gestures merely or by words also,² their performance was surely not intended to make sacred things ridiculous, but to increase the magic power of the incantation.

Valerius, like Livy, does not approve; and, like Livy, he contrasts the rude pantomime of the *iuventus* with the graceful dance of the Etruscans. He misunderstands as completely

¹For a charm against pestilence which may give us an idea of the *carmen* used in Rome, cf. Marcellus Empiricus 15, 11 (see Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa* (1909), p. 821, and Heim, *Incantamenta magica* in *Fleckeisen's Jahrb. Suppl.* 19 (1893), 465 ff.):

si hodie nata—si ante nata
 si hodie creata—si ante creata
 hanc pestem—hanc pestilentiam
 hunc dolorem—hunc tumorem—hunc ruborem
 has toles—has tosillas
 hanc strumam—hanc strumellam
 hanc religionem
 evoco educo excanto
 de istis membris medullis.

²One may reconcile Valerius and Livy by supposing the procedure to have been somewhat as follows: First, a solemn chant by responsive choruses, one composed of priests, the other of young men who added symbolic gestures. For a parallel I may quote Vergil *Aen.* 8, 287 and Servius ad loc. These gestures tended to make the ritual ridiculous, and later on a joking verbal parody of the *carmen* enhanced their effect and ultimately replaced the original solemn formula. Cf. Orendi, *op. cit.* p. 37.

as Psellus misunderstands what he regards as wantonly obscene elements in the Mysteries.¹

Valerius's narrative is in some degree confirmed by Plutarch² who, quoting Cluvius Rufus, affirms that actors performed in Rome before the coming of the Etruscans.

* * * * *

Since the young men were either parodying a serious incantation or repeating it with illustrative gestures, we must, to obtain an idea of its nature, recall the character of the very earliest Italic *carmina*, perhaps a sort of poetic prose such as is found in the inscription from Corfinium,³ the prayer of Cato (de agr. cult. c. 141) and the Carmen devotionis Decii (Livy 8, 9, 6). For as Thulin⁴ has proved, such poetic prose was peculiarly characteristic of recitation the object of which was religious.

The next stage, neglected by Valerius, is described by Livy. Now the recitation was set to music ("descripto iam ad tibicinem cantu"), for these performances were *saturae*, which, as several interpreters have seen,⁵ Livy defines as *impletae modis*.

The meaning of the phrase has perplexed commentators. Webb⁶ suggests 'metrical throughout' or preferably, 'containing a variety of measures.' Ullman⁷ says, "*modis* can refer only to the rhythmical strains of the flute."

May not both be correct? Once granting the probability that the prayer and the parody were not poetry but rhythmical prose, because not composed for dance-music, we can see that the addition of a flute-accompaniment, introduced originally for the Etruscan dance, would lead the chant gradually ("ad saturarum modos *perrepsit*," says Valerius) from poetic prose

¹ Cf. Psellus, Quenam sunt Graecorum opiniones de daemonibus, 3 (Migne), and Miss Harrison's comment (Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion, pp. 569 f. and notes).

² Aetia Romana, 107.

³ Thurneysen in Rheinisches Museum für Philologie XLIII, p. 349.

⁴ Italische Sakrale Poesie und Prosa, Berlin, 1906, p. 74; also Norden, Kunstprosa, pp. 156 ff.

⁵ Birt, Zwei politische Satiren des alten Rom, Marburg, 1888, p. 17, n. 2; Webb, Origin of Roman Satire, C. Ph. VII (1912), p. 184.

⁶ p. 183.

⁷ Op. cit., p. 7.

to alliterative poetry.¹ By "impletae modis" Livy implies that to the original recitative-prose of the incantation and parody were added selections in metre, intended to be sung (*modis*="measures"); thus the original was "filled up", "enlarged" (*impletae*) by passages in metre sung to the music of the flute (*modis*).²

Here one may draw a striking parallel from the mediaeval church. The Epistles and the Lessons at Mass were sometimes 'farced' (*cum farsura*), that is a *tropus* was inserted in the Lesson or Epistle. A *tropus* or trope was an interpolated chant either in Latin or in the vernacular. Earlier tropes were "rough, rugged, sometimes merely rhythmical, but sometimes metrical: in the second (epoch), . . . the merely rhythmical prose disappeared, the verse became more polished and characterised by rhyme or assonance."³ Was not the result a *satura*?

One is tempted to continue the parallel, to point out that such 'farced' epistles often like Livy's *iocularia* gave rise to

¹ Cf. Thulin, loc. cit.:—"Die Grenze zw. Poesie u. Prosa dürfen wir nicht zu streng ziehen. Es gibt ein Gebiet in dem die beiden sich sehr nahe berührten, nämlich das der sakralen Literatur. Ihre beiden Erscheinungsformen, der Saturnische Vers u. die gegliederte Prosa, entsprechen wohl den beiden priesterlichen Funktionen, dem Gesang (ev. Tanz) u. der feierlichen Recitation."

² I do not think, with Ullman (p. 10), that *peragebant* implies that the singing in the *satura* was continuous, not responsive. It signifies rather that there was no reversion to the earlier form;—the performance was consistently a medley of prose and verse. Thus, I take the sense of the passage to be, 'but gave a consistent performance of *saturae*, that is compositions enlarged by the addition of metrical passages in which, in contrast to the original *carmen* and the *iocularia*, (*iam*) the chant and its illustrative gestures were arranged for flute-accompaniment'.

My hypothesis may perhaps draw additional support from an interesting passage in Macrobius (Saturn. 3, 14, 9), who tells us that Cato said of a man to whom he applied the epithets 'Spatiator' and 'Fescennius': "Praeterea cantat, ubi collibuit, interdum Graecos versus agit, *iocos dicit* (perhaps a comic prose recitation), voces demutat (i. e., the style changes, the metrical element appears?), *staticulos dat* (accompanied by dancing)".

³ The Winchester Troper, ed. W. H. Frere (Henry Bradshaw Society, 1894), p. xiii; see also E. K. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage*, Oxford, 1903, I, p. 277 and note 3; II, pp. 7 ff.

irreverence¹ and that from certain tropes in dialogue form sprang the liturgical drama.

I return, however, to the ancient *satura*. To Schanz's objection,² "Es ist unmöglich, dass Gesang und Tanz erst später hinzukamen," the specimens of prayers which Thulin quotes are sufficient answer. Recitative prose and rude poetry lay close together; on both sides of the dividing line were *carmina*; music and especially dancing formed the bridge; but Roman conservatism kept in the *satura* the older form of the prayer,³ side by side with the metrical additions which arose spontaneously after the Etruscan dance was combined with the older ritual.

If such was the nature of the early *satura*,⁴ we can understand why Varro gave the title *satura* to his Menippeans marked by a mixture of prose and verse,⁵ and we may even, as Hirzel remarks in a suggestive note,⁶ trace this characteristic of the work of Menippus back to a similar mixture in early Greek comedy.

That a medley of forms was long considered essential to the *satura* may help to explain the reluctance of Horace to refer to his hexameters as *saturae*. At times, however, Horace deftly contrives to suggest a contrast like that between the commonplaces of prose and the lofty flights of poetry. Compare, for instance, in the Journey the excellent comic effect of lines of almost epic quality inserted in a passage purposely prosaic:⁷ "Hic ego propter aquam, quod erat deterrima, ventri Indico bellum, cenantis haud animo aequo

¹ See on this subject the words of Eudes, archbishop of Rheims in 1250 (*Revue des langues romanes* II (1871), p. 133).

² *Röm. Litteraturges.* VIII, 1, 1 (3d. ed.), p. 21.

³ And, if Livy is correct, of the parody.

⁴ This interpretation of *impletae modis* I had obtained from consideration of the forms of ancient Italic *carmina*. I subsequently discovered that Van Wageningen in the prolegomena to his edition of Persius (1911), p. vii, had conjectured that *impletae modis* might refer to a combination of metrical passages with prose-recitation. As he gives no evidence to support his conjecture, I have thought that my own treatment might not be unjustifiable.

⁵ I am presupposing that Jerome cites Varro's titles correctly, cf. Webb, *C. Ph.* VII (1912), p. 180.

⁶ *Der Dialog*, Leipzig, 1895, I, p. 381.

⁷ *Sat.* 1, 5, 7 ff.

Exspectans comites. *iam nox inducere terris Umbras et caelo diffundere signa parabat*: Tum pueri nautis, pueris convicia nautae Ingerere."

Such a contrast in form might be employed to tickle the ears of an anxious crowd as the recitative passed, under the influence of flute and dance, to metrical invocation; it could compel a sluggish auditor to heed the exhortations of a ragged Cynic, and it could mark the sublimest heights of the Vita Nuova.

M. C. WAITES.

MT. HOLYOKE COLLEGE.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Genetic Relationship of the North American Indian Languages. By PAUL RADIN. May 31, 1919 (University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, XIV. 489-502).¹

Dr. Radin undertakes in this paper to prove the genetic relationship of all North American Indian languages. He notes by the way of introduction that owing to the recent tendency of certain Americanists to consolidate various stocks which had previously been considered independent, or at least not demonstrably genetically related to any other stocks, the thesis maintained in the above paper will not come as much of a shock. That he accepts the conclusions of these Americanists quite irrespective of whether or not they have proved their cases goes without saying. Incidentally he takes the occasion to belittle the work of Professor Boas and his school who have insisted that accurate analytical grammatical sketches of American Indian languages based on texts are an indispensable preliminary before the question of genetic relationship may be safely broached. It should be clearly borne in mind that neither Professor Boas nor any member of his school (so far as I am aware) has ever maintained that the Powellian classification of American Indian languages north of Mexico was final or that every stock listed as independent has been so *ab initio*. They have simply maintained that it is incumbent upon claimers of genetic relationships to prove their cases, and not to rely on guess work. (See Boas, Handbook of American Indian Languages, Part I 44 sq.; Michelson, Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences, IX 222 sq.)

If this article were not by a person who holds a responsible position in a reputable university and if it were not printed in an estimable medium, it might safely be ignored. Such however is not the case. I do not pretend to knowledge of every stock cited, but have an independent knowledge of Siouan, Algonquian, Chinookan, and Yuchean (which last is not cited); and it is on these that my criticisms rest.

The author has seized upon every morphological element in one language that even remotely resembles that of another;

¹ This review is printed with permission of the Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

words of one language which in any way resemble those of another are compared irrespective of whether or not the same or different morphological elements are under observation; words are divided in such a way as to make it appear that they have elements in common even if the division cuts in two morphological units and violates the grammar of the particular language cited; no phonetic laws are given and duly proved as an aid to establishing the genetic relationship of the languages; the writer has such a poor control of Algonquian that he blindly follows the errors of previous workers in Algonquian without once pointing them out: he is satisfied so long as he can abstract anything that will apparently bolster his case. I do not think I shall be contradicted by sober philologists when I say that, with such methods, the genetic relationship of any two languages on the face of the globe could be maintained. In short, in Radin we have the return of a Campbell, Trombetti, Dennison, Gašpićev Gržetić, on whom and their like see the sane remarks of Chamberlain, *American Anthropologist* (N. S.) XIV 51 sq. After such an arraignment it is no more than proper to sustain the charges by actual evidence, which I now proceed to give by a detailed examination of the Algonquian material.

NOUNS (the numbers are those of R's list).

2. Belly; miss-ad, Al. Ojib. Such division is against Ojibwa grammar. 5. Bone; ka-n, Al. Ojib. Wrong division: Fox A'kan", bone. 10. Cold; ka-dj, Al. Ojib. Possibly right division. 13. Eye; osh-kinji (queried), mistake for oshkinjig; translation wrong: o="his"; Baraga nishkinjig "my eye". See 17. 15. Foot; oka-d, Al. Ojib. Translation wrong: it is "his foot"; division o-kad; Baraga nikâd "my leg"; ni="my". 16. Ear; tawa-k, Al. Ojib. No reason to divide the word so; is against current ideas of Algonquian grammar. 17. Hair; oshkin-jig, Al. Ojib. Mistranslation: same word as in 13; observe that the same word is divided in two different ways according as it suits Radin's purpose. 18. Hand; otchi-tji, Al. Ojib. Not an Ojibwa word; taken from Baraga without even noticing that Baraga cites it as a Cree word (see p. 1 of his dictionary); mitchitji is also given by Baraga: divide o-; translation "his hand". 19. Head; cti-gwan, Al. Ojib.: no suffix -gwan in Ojibwa. 20. Hill; wa-djiw, Al. Ojib.: division violates Ojibwa grammar. 26. Mouth; odo-n, Al. Ojib. Queried by Radin. Translation wrong; "his tongue" correct rendition: division o-don; Fox -tunâ- "mouth, tongue"; Radin seems to have ignored nindôn "my tongue" and odôn "his tongue" (both cited by Baraga) because both would be unfavorable to his attempt to connect odo-n (sic) with Kwakiutl su-ms(!). 29. Nose; odja-ni, Al. Ojib.; mis-

print for odja-nj? See Baraga who gives complete evidence that the division is o-djandj "his nose"! Same observations as above. 31. Rain; gi-miwan, Al. Ojib. Shows lack of knowledge of Algonquian morphology; stem gimi-, Fox kemiyāwi "it rains" [kemi- stem; y glide; -ā- inan. copula; -wi 3d sing. inanimate, independent mode]. 32. Sleep; ni-ba, Al. Ojib. Owing to the treatment of n- of stems in composition, it is not possible to know definitely whether this division is right or not; any way n-iba would probably be the division if it is to be divided at all. But I do not lay any stress on this. 33. Snake gine-big, Al. Ojib. Division wrong. 34. Snow; me, Al. Fox. Taken from Jones without knowing that this stem can not be substantiated. 36. Sun; gi-siss, Al. Ojib. Fox kī'ce's^{WA} would have set Radin right in all probability; division gi- impossible. 38. Tooth; bi-d, Al. Ojib. No such word; wrongly extracted from nibid (my tooth) and kibid (thy tooth) both cited by Baraga; lack of independent knowledge of related Algonquian languages made Radin take ni- as "my" and ki- as "thy"; whereas the division is n-ibid, k-ibid (Fox nī-, kī-, not ne-, ke-)¹; if he had only used a little care he would have noted wibid "his tooth" also cited by Baraga which can only be w-ibid. 41. Water; pō, Al. Fox; ni-bi, Al. Ojib. Radin apparently does not know Fox nep¹, "water," the equivalent of Ojibwa nibi; of course the two Fox citations can have nothing to do with each other.

VERBS.

1. to be; -ka, Al. Ojib. Probably merely to make denominative verbs; Fox -'kā-, -'kā-. 18. to speak; te, Al. Fox. Taken from Jones' sketch of Fox; Radin is quite unaware that there is no such stem; the supposed stem te was abstracted from such forms as netenā^{WA}, etc.; but these stand for netinā^{WA}, etc. with vowel-assimilation and belong with āhinātc¹ (Jones' transcription; 'ā'inā⁴tc¹ in mine). 23. to talk; ka-n, Al. Fox. Misprint for ka-n; taken without criticism from the above mentioned sketch; stem kanaw-; division ka-n violates Fox grammar.

NUMERALS.

1. Three; n-iswi, Al. Ojib. No such prefix in Ojibwa numerals. Before taking such an element from the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, it must be shown that in all cases we are dealing with the same morphological unit, which is demonstrably not true. In any case I submit that it is a far cry from niswi to Choctaw tutchina, etc.

¹ Cree nepit "my tooth", cited by Watkins, points in the same direction.

MORPHOLOGICAL ELEMENTS.

5. Causative; -t-, Al. Fox. With inanimate objects only, and so not a fair comparison. 10. Dubitative; -k-, Al. Fox (sign of potential). No such element in Fox; is -'k- meant? Comparison with Ojibwa *gonima* is wrong, for a similar termination occurs in Fox. 28. Imperative; *ta*, Al. Ojib. First person incl. only, and so not a fair comparison. 36. Interrogative; *ä-*, Al. Fox. Queried. Nothing to do with interrogation. 43. Nominal suffix; -*ma*, Al. Ojib. Probable error for -*man*. 51. Passive; -*tä-* (middle voice), Al. Fox. Used only with inanimate subject or subjects; hence not a legitimate comparison. 59. Plural distributive; -*d* (in verbs), Al. Ojibw. Error. 60. Plural; -*n*, Al. Ojib. Used to pluralize inanimate nouns; should be given as -*An*; ¹ it is a piece of daring to compare this with Tsimshian *l-* when the former is restricted as mentioned and Tsimshian *l-* is used pre-eminently with verbs.² If Radin abstracts -*n* from -*on* in verbs (which are inanimate and of the independent mode) he should know that in final analysis the ending is the same as in inanimate nouns (-*on* contracted from -*wan* after consonants). 62. Plural; -*ke*, Ai. Ojib. Special use if genuine, and so not comparable. 73. Transitive suffix; -*t-* Al. Fox. Queried. Not a fair comparison as it is used only when the object or objects are inanimate.

Radin's reply will probably be that the word-divisions he postulates must be right as shown by the non-Algonquian languages, which, he claims, are genetically related. This is simply begging the question. I do not wish to imply that Radin has not cited correctly a single Algonquian word; but I do claim to have disproved more than three quarters of his Algonquian comparisons; and this fact does not inspire much confidence in the correctness of the remainder.

On a previous occasion I pointed out how easy it is to find chance coincidences between Algonquian and other languages (*Journal of the Washington Academy of Science*, IX 230 sq.); but I can not refrain from adding a few examples here:—Fox *magi-* "big", Latin *mag-nus*; Fox *yā-* "go", Skt. *yā*; Fox -*'sit* "if he, she be" (auxiliary, Latin *sit* [Fox -*'si-*, -*t-*, -*'*; Latin *s-i-t*], Fox -*guni-* "day", Turkish *gun*. In all seriousness I maintain that these comparisons are fully as close as those made by Radin. I am, by the way, surprised that he did not claim the genetic relationship of all American Indian languages when he was at it, for Moseteno, a South American

¹ Owing to various phonetic changes, this can not always be easily shown by the evidence of Ojibwa alone.

² Algonquian does not possess the plural "groups" of Tsimshian nor Tsimshian the Algonquian grammatical distinction of animate and inanimate.

Indian language, uses *m* (so widely spread) as the pronoun of the second person singular.

It must not be denied that Radin in one or two instances has corrected his predecessors in their vagaries, e. g., he no longer attempts to connect Yurok *-m* with anything Algonquian, nor Wiyot *-it*.¹

In conclusion I wish to make it clear that I do not deny that some day it may be possible to prove the genetic relationship of North American Indian languages; but I do deny that Radin has proved it: what he has given is an exhibition of linguistic anarchy.

TRUMAN MICHELSON.

BUREAU OF AMERICAN ETHNOLOGY
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Lietuviškos ir angliškos kalbų žodynas. Trečias spaudimas.

By A. LALIS. Chicago, 1915. Litovskij Slovari. By A. JUŠKEVIČ. St. Petersburg, 1897 ff.

Despite the long line of Lithuanian dictionaries of various sorts that have been issued within the last two centuries, there is still no single authority to which the seeker after a Lithuanian word can turn with instinctive confidence. One tries first the most likely dictionary; if that fails one goes from source to source until the word is found or the seeker has exhausted the resources of his library or his patience. Every student of Balto-Slavic or Indo-European would, therefore, heartily welcome any real contribution to Lithuanian lexicography.

Both of these dictionaries have genuine, though contributory, value; but at present neither is generally available to the American philologist. The Lalis, published by a Lithuanian newspaper in Chicago, is familiar to most English-speaking Lithuanians, but Trautmann (*Die altpreussischen Sprachdenkmäler*, Göttingen, 1910) is almost alone in using it for purposes of linguistic research. The Juškevič is frequently referred to by German scholars, but it cannot be very well known in this country; numerous inquiries among the literati, institutional libraries, and native Lithuanians have so far revealed only one copy. And yet the Lalis and the Juškevič are the most important Lithuanian dictionaries published within the past generation.

There is no need for comparison between the two; their aims are quite different. The Lalis, a well-printed, well-bound volume of 1274 double-columned pages (the English-Lithuanian part almost twice as large as the Lithuanian-English), makes

¹ See the warning by Michelson, *Am. Anthropol.*, N. S., XVI 364.

no pretense to be more than a practical dictionary; it is, however, much more than that. Lalis is, I understand, a native of the province of Kovno and he knows many words that are not to be found in the more Prussian Lithuanian dictionary of Kurschat, although he does not, like Kurschat, attempt to distinguish the words which he knows personally from those which he obtained from his various printed sources. There is reason to believe that in selecting his title words he followed rather closely Chodzko's Polish-English and English-Polish dictionary; certainly there is a striking lack of balance and harmony between the two parts of the Lalis, which may be due partially to this cause. As the relative size of the two parts might indicate, many Lithuanian words are found (if perchance they are found at all) only in the English-Lithuanian part; among them such words as *baimytis* 'to fear', *įtempimas* 'strain', *kovotojas* 'champion', *melas* 'lie', *prašalinti* 'depose', *sergas* 'sick'.

As would be expected, and readily forgiven, there are some wooden, traditionally lexicographical definitions. Such translations seem to be inevitable in bilingual dictionary-making; at least one meets them almost everywhere. Thus, *pustelninkiškas* is rendered by "eremitical; hermitical; anchoretic; anchoretical"; *ragožius* is translated by "jackalant"; under *špyga* appears "to fig one; to give one a fico"; the only meaning for *riestaragis* is "one with recurved horns." But for the most part the translations are clear and, while concise, sufficiently comprehensive. Very occasionally the genders are wrong; how can *dubravas* and *dubliai* be feminine?

Modern Lithuanian is more important in comparative study than any other modern Indo-European language; in the Lalis, if anywhere, we should find the present-day tongue. And we do, to a large extent. But the reader of recent Lithuanian literature, whether it be in the poetry and fiction of *Jauna Lietuva*, "Young Lithuania", or in a vulgar American sheet of the I. W. W.-Bolshevik type, will frequently be disappointed. He can readily identify *Bekeras* as the Secretary of War, *monkey biznieriai* as Yankee slang, and *Džyzus Kraist* as profanity; he would not attempt to find them in a dictionary. Nor is he particularly troubled by the lack of such obvious Americanisms as *linčiavimas* 'lynching', *piknikas* 'picnic', *salūnas* 'saloon', *streikas* 'strike'. If the context helped him he might guess at *bliofas* 'bluff' (slang) and *bilius* 'bill' (in Congress). But he certainly has a right to expect respectable recent words like *apžvalga* in the sense of a (newspaper) editorial, *sąjungininkas* 'ally', and *saviapsisprendimas* 'self-determination' (of nations), not to mention words of good historic and linguistic pedigree, such as *antrytojas* 'on the morrow, next day', *atpūskas* (Kurschat) 'Ablass, Ablassfest', *doma* 'attention', *gražia* 'fineness' (e. g. of spirit), *judėjimas*

'motion, question' (in an assembly), *prigulmybė* 'dependence', *neprigulmybė* 'independence', *rinkinys* 'collection'.

Of the Juškevič only the first volume has as yet appeared. It contains about 800 pages and includes the letter J. If this proportion should hold throughout, the finished Lithuanian-Russian dictionary would contain about 2500 large double-columned pages. The second part of the first volume was published in 1904, and nothing has been printed since. The MS of the remainder is, I believe, in the possession of the Petrograd Academy of Science. But in view of the lapse of time and of the fact that the first volume has been long out of print, and in view of general conditions in Russia, both present and to come, it seems very doubtful if the entire dictionary will ever be published. But even as it stands the Juškevič has real and permanent value, at least until a new dictionary absorbs what it offers. The work is scholarly and painstaking; one regrets, however, that the numerous additions and corrections were not caught up early enough in the printing to transfer them to the body of the work.

Juškevič decides the difficult question of the arrangement of the compound verbs by listing them all separately, instead of under the simple verbs. Consequently there is little control of the simple verb from its compounds, which are frequently illuminating as to the meaning and even the derivation of the primitive. I grant that many compound verbs are independent enough to require individual treatment, but I prefer Kurschat's method of including, so far as practicable, the compound verbs under their primitives. It is doubtful, too, if the present condition of Lithuanian lexicography quite justifies Juškevič's confidence in the accuracy of his forms. Very seldom is the slightest hesitation manifested as to the orthography of a word or the quantity and quality of a vowel; little attention is paid to the sources of doubtful words, to variants, or to dialectic distinctions. Juškevič's chief interest naturally lies on the semantic side, and here lies the main strength of his dictionary. The Russian and Polish definitions are numerous and full. Perhaps more valuable still is the light that is thrown on each word from the Lithuanian itself by means of illustrative phrases and sentences and almost exhaustive lists of synonyms, together with cross-references to related words. This phase of the work reveals not only thorough control of the vocabulary, but also remarkable skill and care in its correlation. Many good words are omitted, but no other dictionary within my ken equals the Juškevič, so far as it goes, in the richness and variety of its Lithuanian material.

HAROLD H. BENDER.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

First Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1400. Additions and Modifications to September, 1918. By JOHN EDWIN WELLS, M. L., M. A., PH. D., Professor of English in Connecticut College. Yale University Press, 1919. .

Professor Wells, by publishing this ninety-page *Supplement*, is still keeping us in his debt. Following the arrangement of the larger work, it corrects such errors and omissions in the other as have come to notice, and records publications which appeared between September, 1915, and September, 1918. Information about German publications later than 1914, and especially later than 1917, is admittedly and necessarily incomplete. The relatively small number and importance of errors and omissions found in the *Manual* make the request for forbearance in its preface now seem quite needless. The omissions were largely of obscure, early and unimportant editions and the like, and the errors often small oversights in punctuation and spelling of names. The *Supplement*, therefore, serves well to increase our trust in the *Manual* and our estimation of it.

Professor Wells indicates that he is to bring out a further supplement in the future, and also (which is good news) a similar book on the fifteenth century literature not treated in the *Manual*. For this he invites suggestions and information. One cannot help wishing that he would see fit here to abandon his earlier custom of dividing his book into two separate parts, in one of which he summarizes facts and opinions without naming (as a rule) the critics and their works, and in the other lists critics and works without summarizing their facts and opinions. This means that the first and far larger part, really a literary history, may become antiquated with the advance of historical knowledge, perhaps in a generation or less. A summarizing bibliography, besides often saving the reader's time, can never become antiquated.

JOHN S. P. TATLOCK.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

REPORTS.

PHILOLOGUS LXXIV (1917 and 1918).

Pp. 1-57. P. Corssen, Das angebliche Werk des Olynthiers Kallisthenes über Alexander den Grossen. Callisthenes of Olynthus, the nephew of Aristotle was not the writer of the work on Alexander which is commonly attributed to him. The character of the writer of this work is directly at variance with the character of Callisthenes. Furthermore, Callisthenes did not at the very start accompany Alexander on his expedition, but joined him later in Bactria. Lastly, having been charged with complicity in the conspiracy of Hermolaus, he either was executed at the time or, according to another account, he died in chains from phthiriasis not many months later. The notice of Lydus, *de mens.* IV 107, p. 146 Wuensch—which makes Callisthenes say that he accompanied Alexander to Aegypt—is subjected to a rigorous examination, and the conclusion is reached that there is not a scintilla of real evidence for the presence of Callisthenes in Egypt at the time mentioned. A long discussion is devoted to the passage of Suidas in which the lexicographer quotes a statement about Sardanapalus from the second book of the Persica of Callisthenes. It is shown that in this work Callisthenes was indebted to Hellanicus and that the Persica of Callisthenes must have been a work similar to the Persica of Hellanicus, and could not have formed part of a work on Alexander.

Pp. 58-72. W. Kolbe, Archon Εὐθιος. The author uses Herculean papyrus 339, col. V (cf. Philologus LXXI 1912, 226) to demonstrate that the Athenian archons Euthius and Anaxicrates must be dated 284/3 and 279/8 respectively, and then shows that Diocles must have been archon in 287/6. The old dating, Diocles Diotimus Isaeus Euthius 287/6-284/3, is thus established versus that of Beloch-Tarn (288/7-285/4) and that of Ferguson-Kirchner-Mayer (290/89-287/6).

Pp. 72-91. Karl Hartmann, Ueber das Verhältniss des Cassius Dio zur Parthergeschichte des Flavius Arrianus. Discussion of a large number of passages from Dio in which the author is shown to have been in all probability indebted to the Parthica of Arrian. The study forms a valuable supplement to Roos' *Studia Arrianea* (Teubner 1912).

Pp. 92-118. Leo Weber, ΣΥΚΑ ΕΦ ΕΡΜΗΙ. I: Zwei Archilochosfragmente. [Hes. σῦκον ἐφ' Ἑρμῇ· παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν

κειμένων ἐπ' ὠφελείαι τῶν βουλομένων.] Ψυχὴν δ' ἐξεσάωσα· τί μοι μέλει ἀσπίς ἐκείνη;/ ἐρρέτω· κτέ. as deduced from Ar. Pax 1301 and Olympiodorus on Plato, Gorg. 483 A is probably the original form of the second distich of Archilochus, fr. 6. In the first line of the fragment, the reading *περὶ θάμνῳ* is preferable to *παρὰ θάμνῳ*. There follows a long critical and exegetical discussion of fr. 74, *χρημάτων δ' ἄελπτον οὐδέν ἐστιν, κτέ.*

Pp. 119-130. E. Howald, *Handbücher als Quellen des Diogenes Laërtius*. Portions of Diogenes are examined to determine what groups of authors are represented in three compilations that are known to have been excerpted by Diogenes. It is found that Alexander, Dicaearchus, Duris, Hippobotus, Leander, Neanthes, Theopompus, and Timaeus were used only in compilation A. Another set of authors is represented exclusively in compilation B, and still another in C. Some authors, as Apollodorus, Aristoxenus, Antisthenes and Demetrius of Magnesia, were sources common to two or more compilations.

Pp. 131-183. A. Schneiderhan, *Antikes in der Zimmerschen Chronik*. The antique material in the Zimmern Chronicle is reviewed. The conclusion is reached that Count Froben von Zimmern, a man of moderate knowledge of classical antiquity—a knowledge not extending beyond that which was acquired at school—was the real author of the Chronicle, Hans Müller being nothing more than a secretary. Superior to Count Froben in ability and knowledge was Count Wilhelm Wernher von Zimmern, a man of genuine scholarship who almost creates the impression of having been a trained philologist. To him are to be ascribed the historical portions of the Chronicle that are based on Latin and Greek authors. What else must be placed to the credit of Count Wilhelm is a problem that remains to be solved.

Pp. 184-186. Miscellen. 1. F. Zucker, *Zur Frage des Papyrusmonopols*. The author is unwilling to admit for the Ptolemaic period the existence of a state monopoly of papyrus, but agrees that there is every reason to believe that there existed an imperial monopoly in the second century A. D.

Pp. 187-194. F. Boll, *Zu Stephanos von Byzanz und Herodian*. Boll shows that Stephanus, through a misunderstanding of the grammarian Herodian created such ethnica as *Σκορπιανοί*, *Ζυγιοανοί*, *Ταυριοανοί*, *Τοξιοανοί*, etc. Passages from astrological treatises are cited to show that the alleged ethnica are really designations of persons that were born under the signs of the zodiac indicated in the respective root-syllables of those words.

Pp. 195-204. Otto Schroeder, *NOMOS O ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ*. Interpretation of the phrase. For a review of this

article by Professor Gildersleeve see pp. 218-221 of the previous number of this Journal.

Pp. 205-247. Arthur Ludwich, Ueber die Homerischen Glossen Apions. A new edition, with critical commentary, of all the Apionian glosses thus far published, among which have been inserted in their proper places the hitherto unpublished glosses of Vindobonensis phil. gr. 321, foll. 203 sqq., saec. XIV. For three of the five MSS the editor has used his own collations. The glosses of the new publication are arranged in strictly alphabetical order. Each gloss is accompanied by an indication of the MS or MSS in which it is found, and by a number or numbers to show its relative position in those MSS. Only one-half of the work is here published. The other half is to appear in a subsequent issue.

Pp. 248-282. Leo Weber, ΣΥΚΑ ΕΦ ΕΡΜΗΙ. II. (Continuation from pp. 92-118.) 1. Das Grabepigramm auf die Toten von Kypros (449). Discussion, critical and exegetical, of the epigram transmitted by Diod. XI 62, A. P. VII 296, and Aristid. II 209 D. (=28, 64 K., 512 D.), beginning ἐξ οὗ γ' Εὐρώπην Ἀσίας δίχα πόντος ἐνειμε. The author rejects the view that the epigram was a dedicatory inscription and maintains that it was an epitaph on the Athenians that fell at Cyprus. 2. Die Eion-Epigramme. Discussion of the three epigrams transmitted by Aeschin. III 184 and by Plut. Cim. 7. Weber argues that the Plutarchean version is older and better than the Aeschinean, and defends the order and the genuineness of the epigrams.

Pp. 283-312. Otto Könnicke, Zu Theokrit. II. Discussion of Theocritus 1, 29 sqq.; 105 sqq.; 29, 35 sqq.; 13, 22-24; 5, 94 sqq.; 29, 3; 25, 175 sqq.; 2, 64 sq.; 12, 22; 35-37; 16, 16-21; 21, 15; 23, 5; 6; 18; 57; 29, 19.

Pp. 313-350. M. Boas, Neue Catobbruchstücke. I. Presentation of the results of a careful collation and study of cod. Barb. Lat. VIII 41, s. XIII-XIV, for the Disticha Catonis. An exhibit of the extra-vulgate elements of the text—among them a hitherto unknown distich—is followed by a discussion of selected readings that are thought to shed especial light on the textual tradition. The study concludes with an exposition of the relationship of the Barbarinus to the rest of the MSS.

Pp. 351-383. P. Lehmann, Cassiodorstudien. (Continuation from LXXIII 253-273.) VI. Libripotens. The epithet *libripotens* was first applied to Cassiodorus in the opening of a poem of ten verses contained in St. Gall MS 199. Petrus of Pisa may have been the author of this poem. VII. Der Römerbriefkommentar. Lehmann cites a passage of Hinkmar of Reims which, he thinks, contains a reference to a Commentary

of Cassiodorus on Paul's Epistle to the Romans. He also cites four passages from Abelard which, he likewise thinks, contain references to the same work. VIII. Cassiodor-Isidor-Beda-Alchvine. Study of the indebtedness of Isidore, Bede, and Alcuin to Cassiodorus.

Pp. 384-445. Wilhelm Soltau, *Die echten Kaiserbiographien: Der Weg zur Lösung des Problems der Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. The corpus *Scriptorum Historiae Augustae* is the result of the final redaction by Julius Capitolinus, at about 400 A. D., of sundry historical and rhetorical works (of varying date, character and authenticity) which were fraudulently modified and enlarged by the redactor in a manner designed to deceive the reader and make him believe that the whole was a work of the time of Diocletian and Constantine. Capitolinus was responsible specifically for 1) All the dedications to the emperors. 2) The Lives of Helius, Geta, Diadumenus, Cassius (after Gallicanus), Niger, Albinus. 3) A portion of the Lives of the Maximini and the Gordiani. 4) Probably the Lives of the four usurpers of the times of Probus and Carus. 5) The interpolations from Eutropius at Marcus 16-18 and those from Victor at Severus 19-21. The authorship of the rest of the corpus is to be distributed as follows: Section A (the ten emperors from 117-218) is the work of Spartianus and was composed about 297. Dedications to Diocletian and passages of Eutropius and of Victor have been interpolated. Section D (four emperors from 270-283) is by Vopiscus and was produced about 305-312. All the letters and documents of this section are forgeries, chiefly of Pollio, who belongs to the time of Theodosius. Section B was composed after 360. The Lives of Elagabalus and Alexander were written by Lampridius; those of the Maximini and the Gordiani are partly the work of Lampridius and partly forgeries of Capitolinus. Even the genuine portions of this section are interpolated with forgeries. Section C is the work of a freedman of Pollio and was published under the name of Trebellius Pollio. The Life of Claudius was composed after 345, and the Lives of the Thirty Tyrants and of Valerian and Gallienus, probably later than 360.

Pp. 446-459. Gustav Herbig, *Satre-Saturnus*. *satre* is the Etruscan chthonic god Saturn. Both words go back to a supposed primitive **sayi-dur*, from which were derived **sayi-tur-na* and **sayi-tur-e*, which in turn yielded *sa-tr-e*, *Sā-tur-nus*, *Sae-tur-nus*, *sau-tur-i-ne*, *sa-tur-i-nie*, etc. **sayi-* is related to Lat.-Etrusc. *Savius*, and may be connected with Thracian-Phrygian *Σαοῦ-ά-λιος*, *Σαβάλιος*.

Pp. 460-469. F. Muller Jzn., *Etr. flere*. On the coping of a well that forms part of a picture on an Etruscan mirror (Ger-

hard, Tafel CLXX) is inscribed the word *flere*. Herbig (Philologus LI) concluded that the ordinary meaning of the word was 'iron' and that in the picture *flere* was the Etruscanization of the Greek name Σιδηρώ. Muller, on the other hand, thinks that *flere* means 'casing or coping of a well,' and compares 'falere' in Varro, LL. III 5, 14 and 16, where the context shows that the word means a 'stone reservoir.'

Pp. 470-474. Miscellen. 1. T. O. Achelis, O si tacuisses! (470-472). Boethius, Consol. II 7, is not the only source of this phrase. It is also found in a fable contained in Hervieux' *Fabulistes latins* (1884), p. 654: Si tacuisses, esses (sc. philosophus). 2. A. Zimmermann, Noch einmal die Duenosinschrift (472 sq.). Another interpretation. 3. Carl Erich Gleye, Die metrischen Hermenien der Moskauer mittelhellenischen Sprichwörterammlung (473 sq.). An example (Migne Patr. Gr. 37, 921) is given to show that the Γνωμικά δίστιχα of Gregory of Nazianzus may throw light upon the metrical explanations of the Moscow collection of proverbs.

C. W. E. MILLER.

GLOTTA IX, I (1917), 2-4 (1918).

Pp. 1-32. F. Hartmann, Germanus. Study of the origin of the term *Germani* as applied to the Germans.

Pp. 33-69. Jarl Charpentier, Zur italischen Wortkunde. 1. *squaleo* und Verwandtes. 2. *hedera*. 3. *niger* und Verwandtes. 4. *taeda*. 5. *vervago*, *vervactum*. 6. *cāseus*. 7. *tullius*. 8. umbr. *vaperē* usw. 9. *iūniperus*. 10. *pulmo* und Verwandtes. 11. *milūos*, *mīlvus*. 12. *baia*. 13. *puteus*. 14. *taeter*, *taedet*. 15. *vespertilio*.

Pp. 69-94. O. Lautensach, Grammatische Studien zu den attischen Tragikern und Komikern. (Continuation of Glotta VII 92 sqq., Supplement to Glotta VIII 196.) Study of the forms of the imperative.

Pp. 94-96. Ernst Assmann, Zur Etymologie von δοῦλος und θῆς. The former is a Babylonian-Assyrian loan-word (cf. *dullu*, 'service, work,'), the latter is of West-Semitic origin (cf. Hebrew *tahti*, 'the lower one, the lowest').

Pp. 97-109. J. Geffcken und G. Herbig, Ναξός. Geffcken thinks that in εἰ μὴ ἐγὼ ναξός (so to be accented) παγχρύσεός (v. l. χρύσεος σφυρήλατός) εἰμι κολοσσός, / ἐξώλης εἴη Κυψελιδῶν γενεά (FHG. IV 307), "ναξός παγχρύσεός" was the original reading. ναξός is derived from νάσσω and is in effect = σφυρήλατος. Herbig adds a study on the morphology of ναξός and its congeners.

Pp. 109-112. Nikos A. Bees (Βέης), Die Worte *βόθρος*, *βάραθρον*=*βάθρον* in einer christlich-epigraphischen Formel. Examples of the substitution of *βόθρος* or *βάραθρον* for *βάθρον* in the formula *ἐκτίσθη* (*ἐκαινούργηθη* etc.) *ἐκ βάθρον* (-ων).

Pp. 112-123. W. Kroll, Anfangsstellung des Verbums im Lateinischen. The author gives examples from Petronius, Livy, Cicero, Terence, and Plautus to show for the verb the existence of an initial sentence-position inherited from the original mother-tongue.

Pp. 123-129. Carl Weyman, Lexikalische Notizen. (Continuation of Glotta III 191 sqq.). VI. *circumsisto*=*circumpono*? VII. *confundere*=*fundere*? VII. *iugulum* (*iugulus*)=*iugulatio*. IX. *o(b)stare* used as a transitive. X. *pereger*.

Pp. 129-168. Manu Leumann, Die Adjektiva auf -*icius*. Study of the origin and relationship of adjectives in -*icius* and -*icius*. The words are classified and stemmata indicating their relationships are added.

Pp. 168-183. W. A. Baehrens, Vermischte Bemerkungen zur griechischen und lateinischen Sprache. I. Mixed Constructions. II. Study of certain ellipses and kindred constructions. III. Discussion of several examples of the *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ* construction.

Pp. 183-191. F. Muller Jzn., Damnas. Muller argues, against Brugmann, for the derivation of *damnas* from *dam-natos*. He regards *damnatos* as an adjective from *damnum* rather than as the perfect participle of *damno*, and suggests Osc.-Umbr. origin.

P. 192. W. A. Baehrens, Berichtigung. Correction of Kroll's misinterpretation (Glotta VIII 326) of the author's scansion of Phaedrus I 3, 7.

Pp. 193-202. M. Boas, Die vulgärlateinische Form *prode*. The author favors the old explanation that *prode est* is derived from *prodest* after the analogy of *pote est*=*potest*. Among other new examples of *prode esse* (*prodeesse*) he cites a few from the oldest MSS of the Disticha Catonis. The latter examples, however, he regards as vulgarisms that are to be attributed to the scribe and not to the author of the Disticha.

Pp. 202-208. B. A. Müller, Utricularii. Müller rejects the view that *utricularii* were bagpipers or that they were masters of rafts floated on inflated skins, and contends that they were a guild of makers of *utriculi* (leather bottles) and perhaps also of *utres*.

P. 208. P. Kretschmer, Dissimilationen. Etrusc. *Memrun* (= *Μέμνων*), *Axmemrun*, *Axmenrun* (= *Ἀγαμέμνων*), Lat. *grōma*

(grūma) (= Gr. γνώμων γῆμα), Πολύοκτος (= Πολύοπτος), Lat. sāvium (from suāvium) are explained as examples of dissimilation.

Pp. 209-236. Paul Kretschmer, Literaturbericht für das Jahr 1915. Griechisch. Review of works dealing with the Greek language.

Pp. 236-272. Felix Hartmann (236-264) and W. Kroll (264-272), Italische Sprachen und lateinische Grammatik. Similar review for Latin and the Italic dialects.

P. 272. W. Kroll, Blattfüllsel. Examples of manere and μένειν in the sense of 'dwell'.

Pp. 273-284. A. Nehring, Indices.

C. W. E. MILLER.

BRIEF MENTION.

Persius will not let me go. The 'crabbed coxcomb,' as Daw in Ben Jonson's *Silent Woman* calls him, has crossed my path again, this time in the Loeb Classical Library, where he appears, as often, in company with Juvenal, both translated by Professor G. G. RAMSAY, to whom I last paid my respects A. J. P. XII (1891) 519. The professor, like myself, is an ancient of days, but the Greeks had scant mercy on the *Κρόνιοι*, the *βεκκεσέληνοι*—the Mid-Victorians; and, whereas a writer in a recent *Atlantic*, proclaiming the Remarkable Rightness of Rudyard Kipling, makes an exception of the verses entitled *The Old Men*, there is not one of Kipling's poems that I value more highly as a corrective to the weaknesses of old age. I shall therefore be perfectly frank in what I shall say about the new Persius. Nothing is given out by the editor and translator about the text, not even as to the basis. It is hardly fair to expect an independent revision of the text from every Loeb workman, and, as the difficulty of Persius has helped to baffle the scribes, it is as well. At all events, I have not been at the pains to note the variants from the Buecheler text. There are, however, a few references to Mr. Housman, whose bearing towards other scholars has evidently inspired Professor RAMSAY with a wholesome dread of the editor of Manilius and the pungent lyricist of *A Shropshire Lad*. Apart from this tribute to Mr. Housman, no literature is given later than Conington's first edition of 1872. And yet something has been done for Persius in the last forty years, something to be gathered from Némethy and Ramorino (A. J. P. XXVII 103) or Van Wageningen (A. J. P. XXXIII 236), all of whom have shamed me into reading Persius again. Of course, we find a safe compliment to Casaubon, but there ought to have been a distinct recognition of Jahn's wonderful erudition. As for the translation itself, due homage is paid to Conington's rendering—and no wonder—but Conington is not faultless, as what translator is? In order to make Persius interesting, Conington is apt to overtranslate and undertakes to be picturesque at all hazards; and it is worth noting that Professor RAMSAY feels himself called upon to adopt one of Conington's translations and emphasize, in a foot-note, its aptness of rendering (I, 124 *praegrandi . . . sene*, 'Grand Old Man'), though the translation sins against what ought to be a cardinal principle of a faithful interpreter, not to thrust modernisms into an ancient classic. Frere emphasizes

the canon, and Professor Shorey (A. J. P. XIII 351 sq.) has counted the violations of it as one of the failings of Jowett's Plato.

For one, I resent the intrusion of the shade of Gladstone into the light of classical studies. True, some time ago I cited his translation of the Odes of Horace, but Horace belongs to the whole world, and the failure of my own eyesight prompted an envious mention of the man who in like case held the entire text of the Odes in the grasp of his powerful memory. Just now, however, I am thinking of his various studies of Homer, over which I wasted too many hours at the time of their publication, misled, as I was, by the celebrity of the author. The powerful memory to which I have referred played him false in Homer. Among other slips I remember reading in a magazine article of his on the realm of Odysseus the statement that Homer gives no intimation of the distance between the swine-cotes of Eumaios and the palace of his master. He had forgotten or overlooked the passage in which Eumaios urges an early start (17, 190 f.),

ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ἵσμεν · δὴ γὰρ μέμβλωκε μάλιστα
ἤμαρ, ἀτὰρ τάχα τοι ποτὶ ἔσπερα ῥίγιον ἔσται,

and there are others still more convincing, the collection of which I owe to the kindness of Professor Miller.¹ Those Homeric studies—what a tissue of rash assertions, fantastic combinations and topsy-turvy theories! To a man of my way of thinking, the very title 'Juventus Mundi' is a sad misnomer.

I will not pause to consider Professor RAMSAY's handling of the few scabrous passages in Persius. They are few, it is true, but even more offensive to refined souls than anything in the many audacities of Juvenal, whose Sixth Satire has long been a stone of stumbling to those editors and translators who cater for the teachers of ingenuous youth. Even I who do not consider myself squeamish failed in my Latin Grammar to emphasize an important lesson in case construction by quoting a line to which Thackeray, who chafed under the bonds of Victorian prudery, mischievously alludes—*Lassata viris necdum satiata recessit*, and which teaches the distinction between instrumentality and agency, between

¹ 14, 9; 108; 372 ff.; 15, 37 ff.; 305 ff.; 504 ff.; 553; 16, 130; 154 f.; 169 f.; 321 f.; especially 452 f. and 466 f. compared with 16, 1 ff.; 17, 22 ff.; 185; 190 f.; 204 ff.; 599 ff.

tool and person. And this needful distinction, which is not made in every grammar, reminds me of a droll sentence with which a grammarian, much lauded in his day, begins his abridgment of Livy: *Romulus et Remus lupa nutriti sunt*. Precocious infants, if they knew the difference between the taste of he-wolf and she-wolf!

For many decades we moderns of English or American stock have been more or less devout worshippers of the great goddess Euphemia. But the Tudor translators were not finical. The learned divines of the Jerusalem chamber to whom we owe the Authorized Version rendered the frank Hebrew into equally frank English, regardless of the example of the Masorettes, who offered marginal equivalents. The Caroline version of Rabelais is studded with unbashful words such as seldom see their faces in print. But that was an era when the grave moralist, Sir Thomas Browne, referred to the Library of St. Victor and quoted the treatise of Tartaretus. As time went on the world of print at least became more reserved. The reign of asterisks and dashes began. Mindful of the injunction of Juvenal—arch-sinner that he was—and his 'maxima reverentia' sentence, the editors of the Delphin classics—the favorite editions of my boyhood—sowed the 'ordo' with stars which lighted the wicked boys to dusty dictionaries. The initial and final letters of the national monosyllables were kept apart by an iron bar. One popular translation of the Decameron that I remember called in the naughty Gaul to translate the Italian's more venturesome stories. And so the dull film of decency overspread the world of letters until it reached the opacity of the Victorian age. Scholars ventured to emasculate that spoiled darling of the Muses, Aristophanes, but some of them, alas! did not know what to leave out or what to substitute.

Some forty years ago there appeared, under the pseudonymous authorship of one Kisselak, a little volume which purposed to guard unsuspecting foreigners against the danger of using too suggestive combinations in English. No one thereafter was to quote 'Or by the lazy Scheldt or wandering Po.' For 'wandering' the speaker, careful not to offend the delicate ears of the British spinster, was to substitute the word 'river.' But this brings us into the forbidden ground of the 'double entente.' No vague paraphrase, no clumsy excision, is as bad as the double entente translation. It soils the soul of him who frames it and of him who guesses unless they are

furnished with the waterproof of the philological anatomist. But the attitude of the whole modern world towards sexual questions has of late years been greatly changed. Our benevolent government is flooding the country with circulars that deal with the process—we no longer say the mystery—of reproduction. Beginning at a tender age with the garden in which stamens and pistils and pollen play their part, we advance to the culmination in the God of the Garden and become possessed of what ribalds of an earlier generation would call a *Gradus ad Priapum*. In the future ages there will be no expurgated editions or emasculated versions, but foot-notes excusing the defective nomenclature of some of the most notorious passages.

The first section of this *Persius Brief Mention* was written several months ago and was to have been followed by a comparison of Professor RAMSAY's translation with that of Dr. Hemphill, which the later translator might have consulted with profit. There might have been an incidental discussion of various readings but all such work or play is no longer possible for me, and I am constrained to dismiss Persius indefinitely from my range of physical as well as mental vision. Still, there is one of his vigorous verses that comes up to me in connexion with an apology I desire to make for the grown-up use of Pindar's Eighth Olympian (A. J. P. XL 102 f.). No more searching line in literature than

Virtutem videant intabescantque relictæ.

The curse there pronounced is terrific enough. My youthful association with the Guelphs of a Hanoverian university helped to confirm the aversion to the Hohenzollerns engendered by a semester in Berlin, and when it comes to the question of punishment of those who are considered by some the arch-enemies, I change the line to

<Imperium> videant intabescantque relict<o>.

Some years ago Farrar's Greek Verb was selected by Sir William Osler for special objurcation from the layman's point of view, and I took occasion to say a word or two in behalf of the guild to which Farrar and I at one time belonged (A. J. P. XXX 108). Now that Farrar has been withdrawn from the world and I have perforce fallen out of the ranks of grammatical investigators, I am not tempted to deepen my slight acquaintance with the Dean's performances—doubtless even more antiquated than mine. Other works of his, more popular in their character, are more present to my mind. He

was a man of astounding memory, but his memory was a snare as good memories are apt to be, and his contribution to the Speaker's Commentary was riddled by a critic who pointed out the many inaccuracies¹ that blunted the points and blurred the colors of his frequent quotations.² One of his books bore the catching title of 'Seekers after God,' and it is this title that comes up to me in connexion with one of the most fascinating and irritating confessions ever contributed to American literature, to wit, The Education of Henry Adams. Every education is a manner of seeking after the 'Deus in nobis.' Perhaps I might have brought in what I have to say about the book under the head of the *Ἰχνηράι*, the Sleuthhounds of Sophokles, but the long course of my studies has made me more or less familiar with other seekers, with the Hermotimus of Lucian and the Dialogue with Trypho of Justin Martyr. Lucian and Justin belonged to the same period, a period of seeking. The two quests are in a sense parallel, and Henry Adams and I are, or were, coevals with the difference that he came into the world with the Adams glaze upon him, whereas I was and am still a porous vessel. Of course, the six years that separate our birthdays may count somewhat, and yet he followed me closely at German universities, so far as age was concerned. He was twenty when he was matriculated at Berlin, and I nineteen. True, I was a student of Ancient Languages and he contemplated a course in the Civil Law.³ True, Adams is gracious enough to limit his condemnation to his own department, though judging from the account he gives of his studies at Harvard, he would not have been permeable to the influences that transformed my life. No one less susceptible than Henry Adams to what I have called the catalytic effect of a great man's presence. 'Beyond two or three Greek plays the student

¹ Indeed, if the Dean had been a pagan, he might, when dying, have emulated the example of Sokrates and acknowledged the debt of a hecatomb of bulls to the father of Asklepios.

² I never criticize others without an overmastering desire to make a 'nos <critici> desumus' confession of my own shortcomings in the matter under consideration. Among my misquotations, not thus far acknowledged, I note here Landor's 'sceptred race', which figures as 'princely race' A. J. P. XXIII, 26, l. 7; Milton's 'sport with Amaryllis in the shade' appears as 'play' XXX 108, l. 29; and the 'nuit' of Victor Hugo's 'portes de la nuit' has been deadened into 'mort' XXXIV 115, l. 14.

³ His first lecture was his last. The young man was not very quick, and he had almost religious respect for his guides and advisers; but he needed no more than one hour to satisfy him that he had made another failure in education, and this time a fatal one.

'That the language would require at least three months' hard work before he could touch the Law was an annoying discovery; but the shock that upset him was the discovery of the university itself.'

'He had thought Harvard College a torpid school, but it was instinct with life compared with all that he could see of the University of Berlin.'

got nothing out of ancient languages <as taught at Harvard>' and yet my comrade George Martin Lane had returned from Germany and had begun his quickening work (A. J. P. XVIII 371). As for the Civil Law, I can only judge by the reports that men made to me, by the American students of law at Göttingen and Heidelberg. Their enthusiasm was contagious and, as my own studies brought me into the precincts of the Civil Law, I seriously contemplated the possibility of adding J. U. D. to Ph. D. by becoming a disciple of Vangerow and Mittermaier. A long experience as a teacher has given me some sad reminiscences of those who came into my school with a glaze, however and wherever acquired, and perhaps Henry Adams himself would not have added so many brilliant chapters to his autobiography if the Maryland flaw in his native glaze had not offered an escape to the divinity that was in him.

'God-gifted organ-voice of England'. God-gifted? O yes! but Milton's organ-voice was trained by the ancient teachers of artistic speech, and the great poet whose memory held in store the classic names of the winds made acknowledgment to the Greek rhetoricians, among them 'Phalereus', otherwise known as Demetrius. I have more than once emphasized the waste of time involved in a neglect of rhetoric, rhetoric of the old stamp (cf. A. J. P. XXIV 101 foll.). Writing is after all art, and who studied that art more carefully than the ancient masters? Carlyle lamented that no one taught him the names of the constellations and some of the gifted—all the gifted are God-gifted according to St. James—might have profited by certain elementary lessons. Undoubtedly the author of *Uncle Remus* was a highly gifted man, and it is interesting to learn from his recently published correspondence that his mind was very busy with problems of literary composition, such as are generally considered remote from your natural genius. So, for instance, he insisted on the difference between 'diction' and 'style', but got no further than the formula. 'Diction is the body—the flesh and bone—and style is the spirit.' But diction (*λέξις*) is only one element of style (*ῥημνεία*), and much else goes to make up style. Still *μίμησις* will always hold its own, even with those who have no tincture of classical training, and the admiration Joel Chandler Harris lavished on Cardinal Newman's style is an evidence of his artistic instinct.

ERRATUM: P. 223, l. 1, for 'Single Speed' read 'Single Speech.'—
B. L. G.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-155 W. 25th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Aeschines, Speeches. Against Timarchus; On the Embassy; Against Ctesiphon. With English trans. by C. D. Adams. *Heinemann*, 7s. 6d.

Aristotelis Meteorologicorum libri quattuor. Recensuit, Indicem verborum addidit F. H. Fobes. *Harvard University Press*, \$3.50.

Clement of Alexandria. The Exhortation to the Greeks; The Rich Man's Salvation; and the fragment of an address entitled "To the Newly Baptized" with English trans. by Butterworth. *Heinemann*, 7s. 6d.

Hoare. A Short Italian Dictionary, Vol. II. English-Italian. *Cambridge University Press*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*. \$2.50.

Hoffman (H. A.) Everyday Greek; Greek Words in English, including Scientific Terms. *Univ. Chic. Pr.* \$1.25.

Homer. The Odyssey. With trans. by Murray. Vol. I. *Heinemann*, 7s. 6d. net.

Rivarol. De l'universalité de la langue française, ed. by Comfort. *Ginn*. Bds., 50 c.

Stocks. Aristotle's Definition of the Human Goods. *Blackwell*. 2s. 6d.

Sweet. Roman Emperor Worship. (World Worships Ser.) *Badger*. \$2.

FRENCH AND ITALIAN.

Bandeli (V.) Grammatica italiana per gli sloveni. 8°, p. 264. Gorizia. 3.60 l.

Bresciani (Carlo). Grammatica teorico-pratica della lingua portoghese ad uso degli italiani. 12°, 186 p. *Garnier frères*. 3 f.

Dante Alighieri. La Divina Commedia ridotta a miglior lezione con l'aiuto di ottimi manoscritti italiani e forestieri e soccorsi di note edite ed inedite antiche e moderne per cura di Giuseppe Campi. Nuova rist. Vol. III. 8°, p. clxiv, 2460, con 125 tav. Torino. 60 l.

Dautremet (J.) Dictionnaire japonais-français des caractères chinois. 32°, 344 p. *Garnier frères*. Cart. 3.50 f.

Feghali (l'Abbé Michel). Étude sur les emprunts syriaques dans les parlers arabes du Liban. 8°, 98 p. *Champion*. 15 f.

Foucauld (le Père de). Dictionnaire abrégé touareg-français (dialecte ahaggar) par le Père de Foucauld, publié par René Basset. Tome I. 8°, vii, 652 p. Alger, *Jules Carbone*, 1918. 10 f.

Gilliéron (J.) Généalogie des mots qui désignent l'Abeille, d'après l'Atlas linguistique de la France. (Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes études, fasc. 225.) 8°, 360 p. et 1 carte hors texte. *Champion*. 19.20 f.

Jeanneret (Maurice). La langue des tablettes d'exécration latines. 8°. *Attinger frères*. 14.40 f.

Niedermann. Essais d'étymologie et de critique verbale latines. 8°, *Attinger frères*. 8.40 f.

GERMAN.¹

Aegypten, Das alte u. seine Papyrus. Eine Einfuehrung in d. Papyrusausstellung. [Hrsg. v. d.] (kgl. Museen zu Berlin.) (32 S.) kl. 8°. Berlin, *Georg Reimer*, 1918. .75.

Barić (H.) Beitræge z. slav. Sprachgeschichte. (80 S.) 8°. Wien, *E. Beyers Nachf.*, 1918. 5.

Berichte üb. die Verhandl. d. Sächs. Gesellschaft d. Wiss. zu Leipzig. Phil.-hist. Kl. 70. Bd. 1918. 4. Hft.: Heinze (Rich.) Die lyr. Verse d. Horaz. (91 S.) 2.80 m. 5. Heft: Zimmern (Heinr.) Zum babylon. Neujahrsfest. 2. Beitrag. (52 S.) 1.80 m. 6. Heft: Brugmann (Karl). Verschiedenheiten d. Satzgestaltung nach Massgabe d. seel. Grundfunktionen in d. indogerm. Sprachen. (93 S.) 3 m.

Beschreibung d. ägypt. Sammlung d. niederländ. Reichsmuseums d. Altertümer in Leiden. (X. Bd.) Mumienrärges d. neuen Reiches. 3. Serie. Von Dr. P(ieter) A(driaan) A(art) Boeser. Mit 13 Abb. auf 10 Taf. u. 42 Fig. in d. Text. (iv, 11 S.) 41 x 31 cm. Haag, *Naaml. Vennootschap M. Nijhoff*, 1918. In Hleinw.-Mappe 20 fl.

Bibliothek, Germanische. Hrsg. v. Wilh. Streitberg. II. Abt.: Untersuchungen u. Texte. 12. Bd. 8°. Boor (Helmut de). Die färöischen Lieder d. Nibelungenzyklus. (vii, 214 S.) Heidelberg, *Carl Winter Verl.*, 1918. 7; Lwbd. 9.

Burdach (Konrad). Ueber d. Ursprung d. mittelalterl. Minnesangs, Liebesromans u. Frauendienstes. (S. 994-1098.) Lex. 8°. (S.-A. a. d. Sitzungsberichten d. preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften. 1918. Phil.-hist. Kl.) Berlin, *Georg Reimer*, 1918. 2.

Corpus inscriptionum latinarum consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae ed. Vol. I, pars posterior: Inscriptiones latinae antiquissimae ad C. Caesaris mortem, a Theodoro Mommsen ed. Ed. altera. Pars posterior cura Ernesti Lommatsch. Fasc. I. Adiectae sunt tabulae 3. (vi. u. S. 367-716.) Berlin, *Georg Reimer*, 1918. 60.

Erasmi Roterodami (Desiderii) dialogus Ciceronianus. Ad fidem editionis Basiliensis anni MDXXVIII (richtig: MDXL) ed. Io. Carolus Schoenberger. Pars I: Textum continens. (iv, 83 S.) gr. 8°. Augsburg, *Literar. Institut Dr. M. Huttler*, 1919. 2.

Erichsen (Adolfine) Untersuchungen z. Liósvetninga Saga. (88 S.) gr. 8°. Berlin, *E. Ebering*, 1919. 4.80 + 30% T.

Fischer (Herm.) Schwaebisches Woerterbuch. Auf Grund d. v. Adelb. v. Keller begonnenen Sammlungen u. m. Unterstuetzung d. württemberg. Staates bearb. 57. Lfg. (V. Bd. Sp. 1121-1280.) Lex. 8°. Tuebingen, *H. Lauppsche Buchh.*, 1919. 3 — + 33½% T.

Forschungen, Anglistische. Hrsg. v. Prof. Dr. Johs. Hoops. 54. u. 55. Heft. gr. 8°. Heidelberg, *Carl Winter Verl.*, 1918. 8 m. and 12.20. Reschke (Hedwig). Die Spenserstanze im 19. Jh. (viii, 198 S.) Sigmann (Luise). Die engl. Literatur v. 1800-1850 im Urteil d. zeitgenoes. deutschen Kritik. (319 S.)

Gernentz (Guilelmus). Laudes Romae. (vii, 151 S.) gr. 8°. Rostock Diss. 1914. Rostock, *H. Warkentien*, 1919. 4.

Grimm (Jacob u. Wilh.) Deutsches Woerterbuch. 13. Bd. 15. Lfg. Bearb. v. Dr. K. v. Bahder u. Dr. H. Sickel. (Sp. 2433-2592.) Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *S. Hirzel*, 1918. 2.50 + 20% T.

Heusler (Andreas). Altnordische Dichtung u. Prosa v. Jung Sigurd. (S. 162-195.) Lex. 8°. Berlin, *Georg Reimer in Komm.*, 1919. (S.-A. a. d. Sitzungsberichten d. preuss. Akademie d. Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1919.)

¹ The German titles are taken from "Wöchentliches Verzeichnis" of January to May, 1919. Prices are in marks; T (Teuerungszuschlag) means war increase (2.50 + 20% T = M. 2.50 plus 20% war increase).—G. E. St. & Co.

Hirzel (Rud.) Der Name. Ein Beitrag zu seiner Geschichte im Altertum u. besond. bei d. Griechen. (iv, 108 S.) Lex. 8°. (Abhandl. d. Kgl. sächs. Gesellschaft d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl. 36. Bd. Nr. 2.) Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1918. 4.80.

Jensen (Christian). Neoptolemos u. Horaz. (48 S.) Lex. 8°. Berlin, Akademie d. Wissenschaften, *Georg Reimer* in Komm., 1919. (S.-A. a. d. Abhandlungen d. preuss. Akademie d. Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1918.) 2.50.

Jespersen (Otto). Growth and Structure of the English Language. 3. ed. revised. (iv, 255 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1919. 3— + 40% T.; geb. 4.50 + 40% T.

Kaegi (Adolf). Griechische Schulgrammatik. 10. durchges. Aufl. (xx, 294 u. xlvii S.) gr. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchh.*, 1918. Hlwbd. 5.

Kaluza (Max). Chaucer-Handbuch f. Studierende. Ausgewählte Texte m. Einleitungen u. Woerterverzeichnis. Leipzig, *Bernh. Tauchnitz*. Geb. etwa 7.

Langenscheidt's Lesebuecher. 8°. Faik Bey-Sade: Tuerkisches Lesebuch f. Auslaender. 1. Teil. (164 S.) Berlin-Schoeneberg, *Langenscheidtsche Verlb.*, 1919. Pappbd. 3.75.

Lerch (Eugen). Die Bedeutung d. Modi im Franzoesischen. (viii, 111 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *O. R. Reisland*, 1919. 4.

Motiv u. Wort. Studien z. Literatur- u. Sprachpsychologie. I. Motiv u. Wort bei Gustav Meyrink, von Hans Sperber. II. Die groteske Gestaltungs- u. Sprachkunst Christian Morgensterns, von Leo Spitzer. (Mit e. bisher unveroeffentlichten Briefe d. Dichters.) (124 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *O. R. Reisland*, 1918. 4.

Philon's Belopoiika. (4. Buch. d. Mechanik.) Griechisch u. deutsch v. H. Diels u. E. Schramm. Mit 8 (6 farb.) Taf. (68 S. m. 13 Abb.) Lex. 8°. (S.-A. a. d. Abhandlungen d. preuss. Akademie d. Wissenschaften. 1918. Phil.-hist. Kl.) Berlin, *Georg Reimer* in Komm., 1919. 5.

Schön (Karl). Die Scheinargumente bei Lysias, insb. in d. 12. Rede u. in der 24. Rede. (iii, 116 S.) Paderborn, *F. Schöningh*, 1918. gr. 8°. 6— + 20% T. (Rhetorische Studien, hrsg. von E. Drerup. 7. Heft.)

Schuecking (Levin L.) Kleines angelsaechs. Dichterbuch, Lyrik u. Heldenepos. Texte u. Textproben m. kurzen Einleit. u. ausfuehrl. Woerterbuch unt. Mitw. von Clara Schwarze. (viii, 192 S.) 8°. Koethen, *O. Schulze*, 1919. 5.

Singer (S.) Arabische u. europäische Poesie im Mittelalter. (29 S.) Lex. 8°. (S.-A. a. d. Abhandlungen d. preuss. Akademie d. Wissenschaften, 1918. Phil.-hist. Kl.) Berlin, *Georg Reimer* in Komm., 1918. 1.50.

Uebersetzungen (Deutsche) tuerk. Urkunden, hrsg. von d. Doktor-Hermann-Thorning-Gedaechtnis-Stiftung durch d. oriental. Seminar zu Kiel. gr. 8°. 1. Heft. Mustafa's, d. grossen Paschas von Ofen, 15 Schreiben. Mit 2 Taf. (19 S.) 6.50 m. 2. Hft. 23 Schreiben. Mit 1 Taf. (28 S.) 6.50 m. Kiel, *W. G. Mühlau*, 1919.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Ulrich v.) Kerkidas. (S. 1138-1164.) Lex. 8°. (S.-A. a. d. Sitzungsberichten d. preuss. Akademie d. Wissenschaften. 1918. Phil.-hist. Kl.) Berlin, *Georg Reimer* in Komm., 1918. 1.

— Platon. 1. Bd. Leben u. Werke. (vi, 756 S.) gr. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchh.*, 1919. 28; geb. 35.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Aristotelis Meteorologicorum Libri Quattuor. Recensuit, indicem verborum addidit F. H. Fobes. Cantabrigiae Massachusettensium, *e typographeo Academiae Harvardianae*, 1919.

Bejarano (D. Mario Méndez). Idealismo Jurídico-Político é historia interna de la revolución de Septiembre de 1868. Conferencia. Madrid, Real Academia de Jurisprudencia y Legislación, 1919. *Establecimiento Tipográfico de Jaime Ratés*.

Cassano (Joseph). La Vie Rustique et la Philosophie dans les Proverbes et Dictons Valdôtains. Torino, *F. Casanova & C^{ia}*, 1919. 4 fr.

Cook (Albert Stanburrough). The Old English Elene, Phoenix, and Physiologus. With Introduction, Notes, and Glossary. New Haven, *Yale University Press*; London, *Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press*, 1919.

Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum, moderante Carolo Pascal. Numbers 17, 21, 24.

Carmina ludicra Romanorum. Pervigilium Veneris, Carmen de rosis, Priapeorum libellus. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam, testimonia adiecit Carolus Pascal. 4.50 L.

L. Annaei Senecae De ira ad Novatum libri tres. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendice critica instruxit A. Barriera. 9 L.

P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos libri VII, VIII, IX. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam addidit Rem. Sabbadini. 3 L.

In aedibus Io. Bapt. Paraviae et sociorum.

D'Annunzio (Gabriele). The Rally. Translated by Magda Sindici. Milano, Casa Editrice D'Arte *Bestetti & Tumminelli*.

De Groot (A. W.) A Handbook of Antique Prose-Rhythm. I. History of Greek Prose Metre. Demosthenes, Plato, Philo, Plutarch and Others. Bibliography. Curves. Index. Groningen, The Hague, *J. B. Wolters*, 1918. 228 pp.

— De numero oratorio Latino commentatio. Groningae-Hagae Comitum, *apud J. B. Wolters*, 1919.

Foucart (M. P.) Le culte des héros chez les Grecs. Extrait des Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Tome XLII. Paris, *Imprimerie Nationale*, 1918. 6 fr. 20 c.

Gilbert (Allan H.) A Geographical Dictionary of Milton. New Haven, *Yale University Press*; London, *Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press*, 1919.

Griechische Epigramme. Hsg. von Johannes Geffcken. Heidelberg, *Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung*, 1916. (Kommentierte gr. und lat. Texte hsg. von Johannes Geffcken, 3.)

Hermes. Zeitschrift für classische Philologie. Hsg. von Carl Robert und Georg Wissowa. 51. Band. 4. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1916.

Hoare (Alfred). A short Italian Dictionary. Volume II. English-Italian. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1919. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*.

Homer, Odyssee. Mit einer Uebersicht der handschriftlichen Lesarten und mit erklärenden Anmerkungen herausgegeben von N. Wecklein.

Bamberg, C. C. *Buchners Verlag*, 1916. Erster Teil: Text. Zwei Hälften zu je 12 Gesängen. Geb. je 2 M. Zweiter Teil: Erklärung. 4 Hefte zu je 6 Gesängen. Geheftet je 1 M.

Inter-América. Volumen III, Número 2. Julio de 1919. New York, *Doubleday, Page & Co.*

Laird (A. G.) *Plato's Geometrical Number and the Comment of Proclus*. Madison, Wisconsin, 1918.

Le Cid. Tragédie par Corneille. Edited by J. Marks. Manchester, *At the University Press*; London, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1918.

Le Strange (G.) The Geographical Part of the *Nuzhat-al-Qulub* composed by Hamd-Allāh Mustawfi of Qazwin in 740 (1340). Translated by G. Le Strange and printed for the Trustees of the "E. J. Gibb Memorial." Leyden, *E. J. Brill*; London, *Lusac & Co.*, 1919.

Locchi (Vittorio). The Feast of Saint Gorizia. Translated by Lorna De' Lucchi. With Introduction by Ettore Cozzani. Italian and English. Milan, 1919. (The Jewels of the Eroica, 2.)

Mnemosyne. Nova Series. Volumen XLVII. Pars II. *Lugduni-Batavorum*, *E. J. Brill*; Lipsiae, *O. Harrassowitz*, 1919.

Modern Language Texts: French Series: Modern Section. Du Contrat social ou principes du droit politique. By Jean Jacques Rousseau. Edited by C. E. Vaughan. Manchester, *At the University Press*; London, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1918.

Neuphilologische Mitteilungen. Nr. 1/4. XX. Jahrg. 1919. Helsingfors, *Aktiebolaget Handelstryckeriet*, 1919.

Osler (Sir William). The Old Humanities and the New Science. An Address before the Classical Association, Oxford, May 16th, 1919. London, *John Murray*, 1919.

Phillips (Walter C.) Dickens, Reade, and Collins, Sensation Novelists. A Study in the Conditions and Theories of Novel Writing in Victorian England. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1919.

Robert (Frank R.) First Spanish Book. Revised for American schools by Alice P. Hubbard. New York, *E. P. Dutton & Co.*, 1919.

Robin (Léon). Études sur la signification et la place de la physique dans la philosophie de Platon. Paris, *Librairie Felix Alcan*, 1919.

Slijper (E.) Eene Eigenaardigheid van Tacitus' Zinsbouw. Utrecht, *Kemink & Zoon*.

Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 65. Archeological Explorations in Northeastern Arizona. By Alfred Vincent Kidder and Samuel J. Guernsey. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1919.

Universidad de la Habana. Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Vol. XXVIII. Núm. 1 y 2. Enero-Abril de 1919. Habana, *Imprenta "El Siglo XX"*, 1919.

University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature. Number 3. Classical Studies in Honor of Charles Forster Smith. By his Colleagues. Madison, 1919.

Wells (John Edwin). First Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1400. Additions and Modifications to September, 1918. New Haven, *Yale University Press*; London, *Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press*, 1919.

Yale Shakespeare (The). The Tragedy of Julius Caesar. Edited by Lawrence Mason. New Haven, *Yale University Press*, 1919; London, *Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press*. Text Book Edition. 50 c.; Library Edition, \$1.00.